



Georgia Southern University
Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies, Jack N. Averitt College of

Spring 2018

Emotionally Connected: The Role of Emotional Intelligence in the Work of School Leaders

Tanzy Lewis Mason

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mason, Tanzy L., "Emotionally Connected: The Role of Emotional Intelligence in the Work of School Leaders" (2018).

This dissertation (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies, Jack N. Averitt College of at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

EMOTIONALLY CONNECTED: THE ROLE OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE WORK OF SCHOOL LEADERS

by

TANZY MASON

(Under the Direction of Kymberly Harris)

ABSTRACT

During this era of accountability and standardized testing, school leaders have been inundated with reform models that seek to increase student achievement. However, without effective leadership at the school level, most of these reform efforts will likely fail. The purpose of this study was to examine the practices of school leaders and the role of emotional intelligence in their work in establishing a school culture. Qualitative methods were used to gain insight into the events, processes, and structures that school leaders encountered as they enacted leadership practices. Semi-structured face-to-face interviews were conducted with four school leaders. Teachers who worked with each school leader also participated in focus group interviews. Participants were asked to communicate their lived experiences and reflect on how emotional intelligence impacted the practices of school leaders. In this study, triangulation occurred using multiple streams of data, such as documents and interview transcripts, as well as member checks, which allowed participants an opportunity to read their transcripts for accuracy and to determine if these displayed accurate depictions of their lived experiences. Findings from the study could provide valuable insight regarding the preparation and training of educational leaders.

INDEX WORDS: Emotional intelligence, School leaders, School leadership practices, School leadership performance, Emotions in school leadership

EMOTIONALLY CONNECTED: THE ROLE OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE
WORK OF SCHOOL LEADERS

by

TANZY MASON

B.A., Dillard University, 1998

M.B.A., University of New Orleans, 2008

Ed.S., Lincoln Memorial University, 2009

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Georgia Southern University in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

STATESBORO, GEORGIA

© 2018

TANZY MASON

All Rights Reserved

EMOTIONALLY CONNECTED: THE ROLE OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE
WORK OF SCHOOL LEADERS

by

TANZY MASON

Major Professor: Kymberly Harris
Committee: Yasar Bodur
Juliann Sergi McBrayer

Electronic Version Approved:
May 2018

DEDICATION

To God be the glory for all that he has done in my life. When I reflect on my life's journey, I cannot help but see the overwhelming evidence of His presence through grace, mercy, and favor. He continually blesses me above measure in ways that I could not have imaged. I pray that my life is a living example of His love, for without Him there is no me. I cannot thank my Father enough for the life he has blessed me to live.

This work is dedicated to the many individuals who make up my clan and whose many sacrifices made it possible for me to fulfill my dreams. My grandparents, Evelyn Carmouche, Hayes Carmouche Sr., and Helen Eaglin, have poured into me and shown me unconditional love. To my uncles and aunts, know that I cherish every memory, all of the support you have provided, and the many words of wisdom you have spoken into my life over the years.

This work is also dedicated to my parents, Gabriel and Waver Eaglin. Your self-sacrificing love serves as an example of God's heart on earth. You have prayed over me and interceded on my behalf for as long as I have been breathing. Thank you for your belief in me and instilling in me to seek after God's heart. I love you both! To my sister and brother, Desiray and Marquell Eaglin, I am blessed to have you in my life and love you more than you know. To my mother-in-law, Sonja Mason, you welcomed me into the fold and I will be forever grateful for you loving me like your own.

To my children, Ramsey Lewis, Patrick Mason, Jalen Mason, and Trevor Rose, always seek to leave the world a better place than what you have found it. I love you all so very much! Finally, to the love of my life, Akil Mason, thank you for your patience, unwavering support, and for loving me just the way I am. You are my calm in the storm and my refuge. It amazes me that God saw fit to bless me with you. I look forward to writing the rest of our story together!

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My heartfelt gratitude is extended to my dissertation committee members who offered valuable feedback and assisted me in accomplishing this goal. I would like to thank my supervising committee member, Dr. Kymberly Harris, for being a constant source of inspiration and encouragement. Your guidance helped me to connect the pieces of the puzzle. Dr. Bodur, your feedback helped me to ensure I conducted a study with sound methodology. Dr. McBrayer, thank you for asking thought provoking questions.

I would like to express my sincerest appreciation to the educators who participated in this study. Witnessing the passion you all exhibited was inspirational. Collectively, you all are proof of the power of positive relationships.

Dr. Tonisha Johnson, Dr. Clifton Nicholson, Ms. Cheryl Jenkins, Dr. Uma Subramanian, Mr. Vincent Tolbert, and Ms. Merisa Fruge, thank you for being my sounding boards. You all have discussed my study with me so much that you could probably defend it.

To Riki and Crystal Gilliam, thank you for being some of the best Godparents on this side of heaven. I will never forget the many babysitting adventures and weekends you two kept Ramsey while I traveled the highway going to and from class. A warm thank you is also extended to Erika Drake who also participated in the babysitting adventures of Ramsey Lewis. To the other half of my co-parenting team, Damany and Kiana Lewis, thank you for always being willing to go the extra mile and showing that teamwork does indeed make the dream work.

To my co-hort members, I believe I might be the last of the Mohicans. I am glad to have experienced this journey alongside you. You all proved yourselves to be some of the most supportive people around. May we all go out and continue to be the change we want to see!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	3
LIST OF TABLES	7
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	8
Background	9
Impact of School Leadership	9
Emotional Intelligence in Leadership	10
Statement of the Problem	11
Research Questions	14
Research Question 1	14
Research Question 2	14
Research Question 3	14
Significance of the Study	14
Theoretical Framework	15
Research Procedures	20
Research Design	20
Participants	21
Instrumentation	22
Data Collection	22
Data Analysis	23
Limitations	24
Delimitations	24
Assumptions	24
Definitions of Terms	24
Chapter Summary	24
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE INTRODUCTION	26
Literature Search Strategy	28
Theoretical Framework	29
Principals' Emotional Intelligence and School Climate	33
Principals' Emotional Intelligence with Teachers	40
Impact of Principals' Emotional Intelligence on School Performance and Student Achievement	46
Developing Principals' Emotional Intelligence	54

Chapter Summary	61
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY	64
Research Questions	64
Research Question 1	64
Research Question 2	65
Research Question 3	65
Research Design.....	65
Participants.....	66
Recruitment.....	67
Data Sources	68
Interviews.....	69
Focus Groups	70
Document Review.....	72
Data Collection	74
Data Analysis	76
Instrument Reliability and Trustworthiness.....	77
Limitations	78
Delimitations.....	78
Chapter Summary	79
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS	80
Research Questions	80
Research Question 1	80
Research Question 2	80
Research Question 3	80
Demographics	80
Data Analysis Procedures	83
Data Analysis Results	86
Research Question 1	87
Research Question 2	92
Research Question 3	98
Chapter Summary	107
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION.....	108
Interpretation of the Findings.....	109
Research Question 1	110

Research Question 2	112
Research Question 3	115
Leader Summaries	117
Leader 1	117
Leader 2	120
Leader 3	122
Leader 4	124
Implications of the Findings	126
Limitations	127
Recommendations for Future Research	128
Conclusion	129
References	131
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A LETTER OF INVITATION TO PRINCIPALS	144
APPENDIX B CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE: PRINCIPALS INFORMED CONSENT	145
APPENDIX C INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN FOCUS GROUP	148
APPENDIX D CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE: FOCUS GROUP	149
APPENDIX E PROTOCOL ALIGNMENT MATRIX	152
APPENDIX F LEADER QUESTIONNAIRE	155
APPENDIX G MARZANO, WATERS, AND MCNULTY (2005) LEADERSHIP RESPONSIBILITIES	156
APPENDIX H GOLEMAN (1998) EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE DOMAINS AND COMPETENCIES	158
APPENDIX I PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP CARD SORTING ACTIVITY	159
APPENDIX J PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW PROTOCOL	161
APPENDIX K FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL	162

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Goleman's (1998) Framework on Emotional Intelligence Including Four Domains and 19 Competencies	17
Table 2: Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) Leadership Practices/Responsibilities	18
Table 3: School Leader Demographic Characteristics.....	81
Table 4: Number of Focus Group Participants	81
Table 5: School Leaders' Self-Assessed Frequency of Fulfillment of Marzano Research-Based Responsibilities (Card-Sorting Activity Results).....	82
Table 6: Research Questions 1 and 2 Data Analysis Themes and Codes	84
Table 7: Research Question 3 Data Analysis Themes and Codes	86
Table 8: Goleman EI Competencies Used in Building Positive Relationships	87
Table 9: Goleman EI Competencies Used in Setting the Emotional Tone for the Workplace.....	90
Table 10: Goleman EI Competencies Used in Managing Relationships	93
Table 11: Goleman EI Competencies Used in Practicing Social Awareness	95
Table 12: Goleman EI Competencies Used in Practicing Self-Awareness and Self-Management.....	97
Table 13: Research Question 3 Themes.....	99
Table 14: Goleman EI Competencies Used in Managing Conflict and Resistance.....	100
Table 15: Goleman EI Competencies Used in Adapting to Change.....	103

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The role of the school leader is more complex than ever. In the 21st century, school reform requires leaders to transform schools into autonomous, systems-thinking organizations, revolving around professional learning communities that can embrace change and create a high performing learning environment for students and teachers (Moore, 2009b). Additionally, societal changes have further transformed schools into more dynamic institutions than what previously existed (Crow, 2006). School leaders are charged with ensuring teachers are well trained in developing and delivering rigorous instruction that will engage students and ultimately promote high levels of student achievement. As change agents, leaders must motivate and inspire those that they lead while balancing the ever increasing demands to address issues of higher standards and accountability. The level of accountability directly linked to high stakes testing has become an impetus for school leaders to be actively engaged as instructional leaders. School leaders who cannot create educational environments that increase student achievement often encounter dire consequences. Working in conjunction with issues of accountability, school leaders are also charged with supporting the creation of a shared vision for their school's growth, which includes input from teachers, parents, and community members. Because of the inherently increasing challenges educational institutions must address, “there is an increasing recognition of the importance of school leadership in supporting change and providing for educational equality” (Pashiardis, 2011, p. 12).

Pashiardis (2011) asserted one must redefine the role of school leader and to identify specific leadership attributes and practices that positively impact student achievement. DeFranco and Golden (2003) created a set of standards that identify the knowledge and skills school

leaders should possess in order to be effective leaders. Likewise, Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) identified 21 categories of leadership responsibilities that were found to significantly impact student outcomes. Aiding in this effort, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA), a consortium of professional organizations committed to improving education including the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), has provided standards of professional practice, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards. The standards were devised to provide a national framework that could be used to define the work of effective school leaders. In 2015, the standards were revised to acknowledge the role of human relations in leadership, as well as in teaching and learning. The 2015 standards embody a research and practice-based understanding of educational leadership and student learning (National Policy Board for Educational Administration [NPBEA], 2015). The standards for school leaders emphasized that building a shared vision, a school culture concentrated on student and staff growth, and relationships with families and communities were essential to student success.

Background

Impact of School Leadership

Leadership is of critical importance in the workplace and greatly factors into shaping the success of an organization (Yusof, Kadir, & Mahfar, 2014). Research has suggested that effective school leaders increase student achievement and that successful schools have a clear sense of direction and are supported by school leaders who are effective instructional leaders (Andrews & Soder, 1987; Hessel & Holloway, 2002; Lezotte, 1997; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, and Anderson (2010) conducted a study and

found that the right type of school leadership raised academic achievement. The researchers concluded that leadership rated second only to classroom instruction among school-related factors for improving academic achievement of students. Leadership impacts school organization, school ethos, teacher efficacy, staff morale and satisfaction, staff retention, teachers' commitment, teachers' extra effort, and teachers' attitude toward school reform and change; all of these factors have a direct impact on student outcomes (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Geijsel, Sleegers, Leithwood, & Jantzi, 2003; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000). Leadership, in essence, can positively influence reform, thereby creating a positive influence on student achievement.

Emotional Intelligence in Leadership

Yusof et al. (2014) regarded emotional intelligence as an essential element for any leader. Goleman (1998) stated that the most effective leaders are alike in one crucial way; they all have a high degree of what has come to be known as emotional intelligence. Druskat and Wolff (2001) have said that most executives have accepted that emotional intelligence is as critical as IQ to an individual's effectiveness.

Yusof et al. (2014) noted that there was a relationship between leadership and emotional intelligence. Leadership traits should not only comprise perception or the leader's awareness regarding the day-to-day operations, rather, they should be inclusive of other important aspects, such as the ability to recognize their personal beliefs and attitudes, as well as those of others regarding workplace issues (Palmer, 2003). Leaders blunder in conceptualizing their roles. Fullan (2001) observed that leadership has been mistaken for conventional managerial functions, meaning that leadership is the same as management. However, the two differ regarding the manner in which they deal with subordinates in an organization.

Emotional intelligence helps people to maintain close relationships that are vital in establishing strong teams in the workplace (Creighton, 2005). Teams, in which people share common values and objectives, are more likely to excel than when people work individually. However, there must be strong leadership behind every successful team (Louis & Marks, 1998). Since people have different ways of thinking, as well as capabilities of handling emotions, a leader who is able to understand the thoughts of staff members can help in offering direction regarding workplace relationships. A person with a high-level of emotional intelligence serves as the pillar for the success of the team. He or she can help the people to accomplish a shared vision, as well as empowering them to take advantage of the available opportunities, especially for the purpose of career and personal development.

After a review of the literature surrounding the influence of school leadership and emotional intelligence, it was noted that successful school leaders must recognize and manage emotions to lead and realize school reform. The influence of school leadership could be felt throughout the school and influence everything from the culture of the school to the extra effort a teacher was willing to expend. Creighton (2005) observed that emotional intelligence was a strong tool to determine the capacity of a leader to maintain high-performance for the organization to achieve its objectives. Whether a group of people would likely follow or believe that they would succeed after acting according to particular instructions depended on attitudes and thoughts of the leader (Kouzes & Posner, 1995).

Statement of the Problem

Leadership and school performance have been topics of debate since the 1983 publishing of *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, which promoted the restructuring of public education in the United States to close the achievement gap that existed among students

at both national and international levels (Gardner, Larsen, Baker, Campbell, & Crosby, 1983). Since that time, the challenging context of leading schools had only become more complex due to societal changes and mounting mandates. Among these societal changes were increased challenges in shrinking budgets, state funding issues, changing student and neighborhood demographics, integrating technology into the classroom, implementing character education, promoting school-wide bullying interventions, and adopting Common Core Standards initiatives (Bedessem-Chandler, 2014). Researchers of school reform have found that the demands of meeting these challenges often manifest emotionally in stakeholders in the form of turmoil, resistance, stress, anger, and frustration, as well as other emotions (Blankstein, 2004; Dufour, Dufour, & Eaker, 2008; Moore, 2009a). Left unaddressed, the presence of these stressors can have negative effects on the culture of a school. To mitigate the angst associated with transformation and positively affect change, school leaders must be able to recognize the varying emotions and needs of stakeholders and respond in a manner suited to the situation (Nelson & Low, 2011). This ability, although critically important, is often not developed because learning to deal with the emotions of all stakeholders while learning to manage their own emotions may be a challenging task for school leaders.

In an effort to find a solution to the problem and equip school leaders in circumventing this obstacle, leadership preparation programs, school systems, and researchers alike have studied behaviors and practices that significantly influence leadership success and student achievement. A significant body of research and reviews over the last three decades indicated leadership practices that had the greatest impact on school effectiveness and improvement. The successful implementation of these practices might depend on the leader's emotional intelligence; according to Nelson and Low (2011), this was the single most important factor

influencing personal achievement, career success, leadership, and overall life satisfaction. After reviewing years of documented failed attempts of reforming schools, Moore (2009b) asserted there might be a strong indication that many leaders might not be skilled enough to deal with the emotions and conflicts associated with school reform or to be effective change agents. Moore (2009b) noted, “Emotions can be intense, disruptive, de-motivating, motivating, exhilarating, positive, and negative, and they can challenge the leadership abilities of any person” (p. 21). Due to the many emotions associated with school reform, restructuring a school required a leader who could recognize the range of emotions that exist within the effort to restructure and use those emotions to accomplish the goal of the organization. Many school leaders have overlooked this critical component and approach the work of school reform solely from a managerial perspective. Moore (2009b) further noted the following:

Moving teachers from isolation to collaboration, changing the focus from teaching to student learning, implementing structures and processes that systematically monitor student learning and increase accountability, and distributing leadership is a huge paradigm shift for most American schools. It will be a daunting task and will take an emotional toll on teachers, students and principals. For school leaders to think they can make such a cultural shift without resistance, conflict and emotions, is to say that the leaders have not been well educated in the research of leading change. (p. 22)

In this regard, the behaviors of school leadership and their consequent day-to-day practices were of critical importance (Lingam & Lingam, 2015). Due to the high level of human interaction found within educational institutions, it was of great importance to examine the effects of emotional intelligence on leadership performance.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to examine the practices of school leaders and the role of emotional intelligence in their work in establishing a school culture. Three questions were determined for the purpose of this study. The questions were as follows:

Research Question 1

How do school leaders view the role of emotions in the execution of their duties?

Research Question 2

What characteristics of emotional intelligence do school leaders report when they describe their leadership practices?

Research Question 3

How do teachers report that school leaders use emotional intelligence when faced with challenges?

Significance of the Study

During this era of accountability and standardized testing, school leaders have been inundated with reform models that seek to increase student achievement. However, without effective leadership at the school level, most of these reform efforts will likely fail (Lingam & Lingam, 2015). Accordingly, researchers have indicated that effective leadership plays a significant role in student achievement and that a large determinant of effective leadership is emotional intelligence (Kouzes & Posner, 2012; Moore, 2009b). The current study, on the role of emotional intelligence on leadership practices, was of importance, as it further added to the body of research that has sought to improve school leadership performance. Findings from the study could provide valuable insight regarding the preparation and training of educational leaders.

With the knowledge that emotional intelligence could be taught (Sadri, 2011), data could support the inclusion of emotional intelligence competencies in leader preparation programs, as leaders of institutions of higher learning have sought to design curriculum that could meet the diverse needs of 21st century educational change agents. This study was also useful for school districts as the leaders sought to recruit, hire, and retain other leaders who could recognize and address the complex needs of schools undergoing reform. The data provided justification for professional development in the area of emotional intelligence at both the systemic and school levels.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical frameworks for this study included Goleman's (1998) theory of emotional intelligence and Marzano et al.'s (2005) work on research-based leadership practices that could influence student achievement. Goleman (1998) focused on the influence of emotional competencies on an individual's professional performance. Marzano et al. (2005) sought to identify educational leadership practices that significantly impacted student achievement and thereby contributed to successful leadership. Individually, these frameworks assisted in identifying and strengthening often-overlooked leadership skills. As a dual construct, these theories showed insight into ways in which emotional intelligence related specifically to school leadership performance.

Although Salovey and Mayer (1990) coined the term emotional intelligence as part of their research, the concept was grounded in the work of E. L. Thorndike (1920) who originally referred to the idea as social intelligence. Thorndike posited social intelligence was a person's ability to manage people and make wise decisions when interacting with others. Salovey and Mayer (1990) later defined emotional intelligence as "a form of intelligence that involves the

ability to monitor one's own and others' beliefs and emotions to discriminate among them, and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions" (p. 56). One of the researchers later revised the definition to state the following: "The capacity to reason with emotion in four areas: to perceive emotion, to integrate it into thought, to understand it and to manage it" (Mayer, 1999, p. 86).

Though many researchers sought to advance the concept, it was Goleman's *Emotional Intelligence* book published in 1995 that popularized the concept. Goleman (1995) studied competency models in 181 positions in 121 corporations worldwide. He found that 67% of the competencies that were considered fundamental were emotional competencies. Goleman et al. (2002) identified 19 competencies and classified them into four domains of emotional intelligence as indicated in Table 1. Researchers have determined that emotional competencies are learned, can be taught, and that mastery of these competencies develops over time (Goleman, 1998).

Table 1

Goleman's (1998) Framework on Emotional Intelligence Including Four Domains and 19 Competencies

Self Awareness	Social Awareness
Emotional self-awareness: Reading one's own emotions and recognizing their impact; using "gut sense" to guide decisions	Empathy: Sensing others' emotions, understanding their perspective, and taking active interest in their concerns
Accurate self-assessment: Knowing one's strengths and limits	Organizational awareness: Reading the currents, decision networks, and politics at the organizational level
Self-confidence: A sound sense of one's self-worth and capabilities	Service: Recognizing and meeting follower, client, or customer needs
Self Management	Relationship Management
Emotional self-control: Keeping disruptive emotions and impulses under control	Inspirational leadership: Guiding and motivating with a compelling vision
Transparency: Displaying honesty and integrity; trustworthiness	Influence: Wielding a range of tactics for persuasion
Adaptability: Flexibility in adapting to changing situations or overcoming obstacles	Developing others: Bolstering others' abilities through feedback
Achievement: The drive to improve performance to meet inner standards of excellence	Change catalyst: Initiating, managing, and leading in a new direction
Initiative: Readiness to act and seize opportunities	Conflict management: Resolving disagreements
Optimism: Seeing the upside in	Building bonds: Cultivating and maintaining a web of relationships
	Teamwork and collaboration: Cooperation and team building

The second construct that guided the framework of this study was the work of Marzano et al. (2005), who sought to assist educational reform efforts. While working with The Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) in 1998, the researchers conducted a meta-analysis, which synthesized over three decades of research on the effects of leadership on student achievement. The study examined student characteristics, teacher practices, and school practices that were linked to school effectiveness. After analyzing more than 5000 studies, Marzano et al. (2005) identified 21 research-based practices of effective school leaders that influenced student achievement, as outlined in Table 2.

Table 2

Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) Leadership Practices/Responsibilities

Responsibility	Description
(1) Affirmation	Recognizes and celebrates accomplishments and acknowledges failure
(2) Change Agent	Is willing to challenge and actively challenges the status quo
(3) Contingent Reward	Recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments
(4) Communication	Establishes strong lines of communication with and among teachers and students
(5) Culture	Fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation
(7) Flexibility	Adapts his or her leadership behavior to the needs of the current situation and is comfortable with dissent
(8) Focus	Establishes clear goals and keeps those goals in the forefront of the school's attention
(9) Ideals/Beliefs	Communicates and operates from strong ideals and beliefs about schooling
(10) Input	Involves teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies
(11) Intellectual stimulation	Ensures faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices and makes the discussion of these a regular aspect of the school's culture
(12) Involvement in curriculum, instruction, and assessment	Is directly involved in the design and implementation of curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices
(13) Knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment	Is knowledgeable about current curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices
(14) Monitoring/Evaluating	Monitors the effectiveness of school practices and their impact on student learning
(15) Optimizer	Inspires and leads new and challenging innovations
(16) Order	Establishes a set of standard operating procedures and routines
(17) Outreach	Is an advocate and spokesperson for the school to all stakeholders
(18) Relationships	Demonstrates an awareness of the personal aspects of teachers and staff
(19) Resources	Provides teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their jobs
(20) Situational Awareness	Is aware of the details and undercurrents in the running of the school and uses this information to address current and potential problems
(21) Visibility	Has quality contact and interactions with teachers and students

Although Marzano et al. (2005) underscored that all 21 responsibilities were vital in promoting change, the researchers determined that several responsibilities were more effective in

promoting what they termed as first- and second-order change. First-order change is incremental and can be thought of as the actions that directly impact daily operations of a school. Incremental change occurs in small steps that do not overturn past practices. First order change responsibilities include monitoring/evaluating relationships, order, and discipline.

The second category of responsibilities was classified as second-order change practices. Marzano et al. (2005) identified second order change as “change that alters the system in fundamental ways offering a dramatic shift in direction and requiring new ways of thinking and acting” (p. 66). Second order change addresses the philosophical underpinnings of an organization. The uncomfortable nature of school reform, with its emphasis on transforming practices, requires successful second order change that quickly shifts the work of the school.

Marzano et al. (2005) indicated that there was a lack of attempt of second order change due to the discomfort it caused and that this was the reason why issues, such as the achievement gap, could not be resolved. Marzano et al. (2005) determined responsibilities, such as knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment; optimizer; intellectual stimulation; change agent; monitoring/evaluating; flexibility; and ideals/beliefs, were essential to implementing second order change effectively (p. 70). While leadership theory and practices were previously studied, this study was the first to identify the statistical significance of practices that impact student achievement (Marzano et al., 2005). The researchers contended that findings from the meta-analysis were a new component to leadership research and theory. The quantification of each leadership responsibility provided insight into just how much each contributed to a leader’s effectiveness and ability to guide school improvement efforts. To some extent, the identification of the 21 leader responsibilities provided school leaders with a roadmap of practices that could be implemented as a means of improving daily practices.

According to Bradberry and Greaves (2005), an individual's emotions are linked to the ability to be rational, problem solve, and make quality decisions. This knowledge was of critical importance, as these activities largely factored into the school leader's primary task of dealing with the behavioral, emotional, and cognitive processes of stakeholders, as well as their own internal processing. Ciarrochi and Mayer (2007) indicated that interpersonal relationships were important determinants of school effectiveness. With this knowledge, school leaders could gain insight into ways in which to address fundamental components of their professional practices by identifying the influence that emotional intelligence had on the ability to enact research-based practices that positively correlated to student achievement.

Research Procedures

Research Design

A qualitative research design was employed for this study. The choice of a qualitative methodology was determined by the nature of the research; qualitative data, with its emphasis on people's lived experiences, were well suited for locating the meanings people placed on the events, processes, and structures of their lives and for connecting these meanings to the social world (Miles, Huberman, & Saladana, 2013). Qualitative research is a method for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem (Creswell, 2014). The construct of school reform, with its varied interactions between school leaders and stakeholders, required school leaders to exhibit social awareness and relationship management regularly to mitigate the stress that was often associated with school reform. Understanding the role of emotions in the work of school leaders might affect social change and leadership practices, and thereby positively influence school reform efforts.

Semi-structured face-to-face interviews were conducted with four school leaders and analyzed for common themes. This study also utilized focus groups consisting of teachers who worked with the school leaders. These research methods allowed the researcher to probe participants' responses by utilizing follow-up questions to gain deeper meaning or further insight regarding the research topic. In this study, participants were asked to communicate their lived experiences and reflect on the extent to which emotional intelligence impacted the practices of school leaders. Another form of data was gathered from the review of documents to triangulate the data. In this study, triangulation occurred using multiple streams of data, as well as member checks, which allowed participants an opportunity to read their transcripts for accuracy and to determine if the ideas, behaviors, and self-reported events were accurate depictions of their lived experiences.

Participants

The researcher interviewed four school leaders in the southeastern region of the United States. This population was actively engaged in daily leadership activities that required interactions that influenced the work of various stakeholders. The study utilized the technique of criterion sampling to ensure rich data were captured. School leaders must have at least five years of leadership experience and also serve as a school principal. The sample was purposeful in nature due to the researcher intentionally selecting only school leaders who worked at the secondary level.

Other participants in the study were teachers supervised by each of the identified leaders. The researcher secured a list of staff members who worked with each leader a minimum of two years. Five staff members of each school leader were invited to participate in a focus group interview to solicit responses about the practices of the school leader. These participants were

well suited to provide data about their leader's emotional intelligence because they experienced it regarding the purpose and work of the team.

Instrumentation

The researcher used semi-structured face-to-face interviews to solicit responses from participants about how emotional intelligence impacted leadership practices. A key benefit of using the semi-structured interview was its attention to the lived experience of the participants, while attending to theoretical variables of interest (Galletta, 2013). This method of data collection proved advantageous in collecting data about phenomena that were not easily observed, such as respondents' beliefs, attitudes, and inner experiences (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). Open-ended interview questions were aligned to the literature reviewed and research questions that guide the study. Varying types of questions were asked of the population, including background and demographic, knowledge, experience or behavior, and opinion or values questions.

Data Collection

After receiving approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Georgia Southern University to conduct the study, the researcher applied to conduct the study through the school district's Department of Research and Evaluation. After receiving the names of the school leaders, the researcher contacted the prospective school leaders to issue letters of IRB approval and provide information regarding the nature of the study, their role in the study, confidentiality, and contact information. The IRB letter outlined the method of data collection and analysis. After the researcher determined which school leaders were willing to participate in the study, the researcher and each participant selected a mutually agreed on time and place to conduct an interview. Participants were asked to sign an informed consent form. Each interview occurred in

a space conducive to privacy and minimal disruptions. Each school leader was informed of the recording devices that were used to create a record of the meeting. The school leaders were asked to reflect on their experiences and the role of emotions in their work. These reflections were recorded electronically during the interview and transcribed for analysis.

The researcher secured a list of staff members who worked with each leader a minimum of two years to gain insight into the practices of the school leader. After determining which teachers were willing to participate in the study, the researcher and participants selected a mutually agreed upon time and place to conduct the focus group. Focus group participants were informed of the recording devices that were used to create a record of the meeting. The participants were asked to reflect on their experiences and the role of emotions in the work of the school leaders. These reflections were recorded electronically during the interview and transcribed for analysis.

Data Analysis

Creswell (2014) contended data analysis could be accomplished in six stages: (a) organizing and preparing the data; (b) reading through the data; (c) beginning the process of coding the data into brackets or chunks; (d) using the coding process to generate a description of the setting, people, categories, or themes; (e) advancing how the description of themes were represented in the qualitative narrative; and (f) interpreting the data. Utilizing the process outlined by Creswell, the researcher collected data by conducting semi-structured face-to-face interviews, sorting the data into categories, coding the data and generating themes, searching for emerging understandings, and formatting the data as qualitative text.

Limitations

Because this research was conducted only within a specific geographical region, it could be argued that school leaders might not be as willing to participate in the study for fear of being identified and receiving negative feedback. School leaders who perceived that they had low levels of emotional intelligence did not elect to participate in the study.

Delimitations

The researcher chose to use data only from school leaders in the southeastern region of the United States due to the ease of collecting data. The small sample size did not produce findings that could be generalized to a larger population. In addition, the researcher only used data collected during the 2017 to 2018 school year.

Assumptions

The primary assumption made by the researcher was that the participants provided truthful responses regarding their experiences. The experiences of the participants were valuable to others encountering similar situations when implementing reform efforts in schools.

Definitions of Terms

School leader. A school leader refers to a principal with a minimum of five years of leadership experience who has served in the capacity of a principal for a minimum of two years.

Teacher. Teachers supervised by the identified leaders for a minimum of two years.

Emotional intelligence. The capacity to reason with emotion in four areas: to perceive emotion, to integrate it into thought, to understand it and to manage it (Mayer, 1999, p. 86).

Chapter Summary

Emotional intelligence is significant in maintaining strong leadership, and is a strong performance assessment tool, especially when an organization needs to engage people in

leadership positions. Competence in leadership translates to high-levels of emotional intelligence (Jamali, Sidani, & Abu-Zaki, 2008). Emotional intelligence helps in distinguishing leaders from managers. A competent leader is proactive regarding his or her relationship with staff while a manager has less concern about emotions. However, managers can be strong leaders if they possess a high-level of emotional intelligence. Emotional intelligence helps in promoting high commitment among staff, as well as teamwork that is significant for the success of an organization. Emotional intelligence determines the reaction of leaders regarding occurrences, enabling them to find solutions to issues that may arise unexpectedly. A high-level of emotional intelligence in leaders is significant in the maintenance of enthusiasm in the workplace.

In education, emotional intelligence in leaders helps in maintaining a favorable learning environment, as well as creation of harmonious relations between staff and the students. Moreover, it promotes understanding among leaders, which is important in assisting the staff to foster a strong relationship with the students. Emotional intelligence promotes the desired interactions in the learning environment, which is important in maintaining high commitment in staff and good performance amongst students. Through further research regarding the implications of emotional intelligence in education, leaders can learn to maintain competence and high commitment among staff, which can be a deterrent to teacher burnout and also foster strong relationships between them and students.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE INTRODUCTION

Up until the early 1980s, principals and school administrators traditionally practiced leadership in a managerial style that focused on running tasks and maintaining schools in a rational order that was hierarchical and supervisory (Hitt & Tucker, 2016). The 1983 release of *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* dramatically changed how the United States viewed the public school system and promoted significant educational reform of these institutions nationally (Ashworth, 2013; Gardner et al., 1983). As principals and school administrators are the figures held accountable by higher authorities and parents for effective school performance, the critique of public education has also called for re-examination of school leadership (Ashworth, 2013; Bumphus, 2008). In 2001, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) standardized educational outcomes at the state level (Ashworth, 2013; Elmore, Forman, Stosich, & Bocala, 2014). The sum of federal and state mandates for education increased standardized testing and the demand for accountability (Ashworth, 2013; Bumphus, 2008; Elmore et al., 2014; Moore, 2009a; Summers, 2015). As such, teacher evaluation and principal evaluation initiatives have changed everyday practices in the classroom just as much as principals' daily school leadership as the pressures of accountability measures have been compounded by increasingly dynamic societal changes (Ashworth, 2013; Bumphus, 2008; Cohen, 2013; Cosner & Jones, 2016; Elmore et al., 2013; Goodwin & Babo, 2014).

Among these societal changes are increased challenges in shrinking budgets, state funding issues, changing student and neighborhood demographics, integrating technology into the classroom, implementing character education and school-wide bullying interventions, and adopting Common Core Standards initiatives (Bedessem-Chandler, 2014). A number of schools

have been unable to respond to external pressures for improvement in spite of the threat of defunding or closure (Elmore et al., 2014). A large part of this has been due to the fact that the accountability and standardized testing systems have measured performance, but have not provided steps or guidance for how to improve performance (Elmore et al., 2014). Such demands have required more complex leadership from principals beyond the managerial model and have required not only organizational skills, but social and emotional competencies also (Bumphus, 2008). This is because researchers of school reform have found that the demands of meeting the challenges of increasing mandates and accountability oftentimes manifest themselves emotionally in stakeholders in the form of turmoil, resistance, stress, anger, and frustration as well as other emotions (Blankstein, 2004; Dufour et al., 2008; Moore, 2009b). Left unaddressed, the presence of these stressors can have negative effects on the culture of a school and in turn impact the school's efficacy and learning environment. In order to mitigate the angst associated with transformation and positively affect change, school leaders must be able to recognize the varying emotions and needs of stakeholders and respond in a manner suited to the situation (Nelson & Low, 2011).

Although school leaders' emotional intelligence has become increasingly acknowledged as critically important, emotional competence is often not targeted for educational leaders' professional development (Bumphus, 2008; Moore, 2009b; Yamamoto, Gardner, & Tenuto, 2013). Although there is some attention to emotion in educational leadership in the literature, much of the research neglects emotion in theory and practice (Yamamoto et al., 2013). Furthermore, learning to deal with the emotions of all stakeholders while learning to manage their own emotions may be a challenging task for school leaders who also experience their own share of failure, disappointment, hostility, rejection, and frustration (Bumphus, 2008; Day &

Sammons, 2013; Yamamoto et al., 2013). The personal challenges leaders face in emotional competencies are further exacerbated by the lack of funding and initiatives for emotional intelligence professional development, coaching, and feedback, which are limited if not scarce (Moore, 2009b).

Literature Search Strategy

For the following review of the literature, the databases used included EBSCOHost, ProQuest, Google Scholar, ERIC, and JSTOR. The main key terms used for the study's search included *emotional intelligence*, *school leaders*, *principal's school accountability*, *school reform*, *school performance*, *student achievement*, *social intelligence*, *developing emotional intelligence*, *emotional intelligence training*, and *leadership preparation programs*. Given the present study's focus, these search terms were used in combination with "AND," as well as in combination with the terms: *secondary schools* and *high schools*. These key terms produced articles relevant to the present study's focus on perceptions that school leaders have toward the value of emotional intelligence and their use of it, as well as how to cultivate emotional intelligence in school leaders. Much of the literature regarding emotional intelligence lied within the fields of business, organization, and industry; therefore, there was a gap on how to develop emotional intelligence within school leaders regarding accountability. As such, some research from these industries regarding the emotional intelligence of leaders were consulted, as were some articles older than 2013 and international studies that met the present study's specificity of developing emotional intelligence in school principals. Most articles were recent and published between 2013 to 2017, except the aforementioned, as well as those seminal works of emotional intelligence theory that grounded the framework for the present study.

Theoretical Framework

Mayer and Salovey (1990), who set out to analyze the concept's development within the intelligence field, established the most recent paradigm of emotional intelligence (EI). Among the types of intelligence, such as abstract intelligence and mechanical intelligence, the authors explored Gardner's categories of personal intelligences and cite a prevailing definition of social intelligence as the ability to understand people and therefore manage them. However, the authors sought to redeem social intelligence from a prevailing understanding of social intelligence as manipulation. Instead, the authors embraced social intelligence for its usefulness as an ability for constructive thinking that is adaptive to and effective within an environment.

The authors further set out to distinguish EI as a subset of social intelligence and constructed their seminal definition of EI as the “the ability to monitor one's own and other's feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions” (Mayer & Salovey, 1990, p. 189). However and most importantly, the theorists emphasized that emotional intelligence was more than a general appraisal of self and others; rather, EI was the recognition and use of emotional states for solving problems and regulating behaviors.

At the time of Mayer and Salovey's (1990) writing, EI research was a body of literature “dismembered and scattered over a diversity of journals, books, and subfields of psychology” (p. 189). These theorists' work not only crafted a unified framework of EI, but spurred what would become its own research field in educational leadership and teaching practices. Mayer and Salovey's (1990) two principles of social intelligence and EI have provided the groundwork for Goleman's (2000) EI theory in organizational leadership. Goleman's (2000) theory of EI was developed and has been widely established in the context of business, administration, and

organizational culture. Although relatively far less established in the educational sector, the importance of Goleman's (1998, 2000) EI principles has been grounded in the field, whether it regards emotional and social intelligence of students and their academic achievement (Akomolafe & Adebayo, 2012; Chong, Li, Roslan, & Baba, 2015; Li & Lerner, 2013; Matešić, 2015; Reyes, Brackett, Rivers, White, & Salovey, 2012); between parents and students (Heller, 2017; Vahedi & Nikdel, 2011); among teachers and their students (Daneshmand, 2013; Heller, 2017; Nathanson, Rivers, Flynn, & Brackett, 2016); and among teachers and school leaders (Akomolafe & Olatomide, 2013; Bedessem-Chandler, 2014; Berkovich & Eyal, 2017; Cliffe, 2011; Grobler, 2014; Juma, 2013; Pierce, 2014; Sun & Leithwood, 2015; Taliadorou & Pashiardis, 2015). The EI research that exists in the education field has largely treated the topic of teachers' EI with their students (Heller, 2017; Nathanson et al., 2016); the importance of school leaders' EI as it impacts school performance and student achievement, although recognized, has been comparably less examined.

The research has been nearly unanimous in identifying teachers as the single greatest influence on student academic achievement more so than any other school-related factor (Goodwin & Babo, 2014; Hitt & Tucker, 2016; Pierce, 2014). However, teachers can only be effective in their work if provided the right environment and job satisfaction to spur the motivation, commitment, and retention of quality teachers (Akomolafe & Adebayo, 2012; Akomolafe & Olatomide, 2013). Conversely, it has been debated whether administrators can or do have any effect on academic achievement (Gaddis, 2016; Summers, 2015). However, the principal has the greatest responsibility for ensuring the optimal environment and resources for teachers and students to achieve academically, while juggling budget issues, cultural and demographic needs, as well as accountability and achievement standards. Increased state and

federal scrutiny has demanded a new generation of school leadership that addresses how to meet both local and federal mandates, while still implementing the appropriate models for improving classroom instructional practice and student achievement for a school's particular culture (Goodwin & Babo, 2014). Ensuring a positive environment, job satisfaction, and therefore motivation for teachers in the face of mounting stressors and external demands requires significant EI on the part of the administrator (Berkovich & Eyal, 2017; Pierce, 2014). The administrator must identify the idiosyncratic needs of each individual teacher, which can vary across a spectrum of extremes from needing significant social support to requiring autonomy and independence (Barnes, 2015). Thus, the EI of school leaders has become of urgent importance in the study of school climate as it impacts student achievement (Ashworth, 2013; Barnes, 2015; Berkovich & Eyal, 2015; Berry, 2013; Brinia, Zimianiti, & Panagiotopoulos, 2014; Bumphus, 2008; Davids, 2016; Döş & Savaş, 2015; Grobler, Moloi, & Thakhordas, 2017; Segredo, 2014; Wang, Wilhite, & Martino, 2016).

Addressing the debate around the impact school leaders have on student achievement, Waters et al. (2003) produced a landmark millennial study of the effects of leadership practices on student achievement. In this seminal work, the researchers conducted a quantitative meta-analysis of three decades of research that included almost every study available since the 1970s. Of 5,000 studies surveyed, a final 70 met the researchers' criteria and from which the authors produced the framework of 21 responsibilities of school leaders that are significantly correlated with student achievement. The final meta-analysis study sample consisted of 2,894 schools, approximately 1.1 million students, and 14,000 teachers. The researchers discovered that the average effect size between leadership and student achievement is .25 when expressed as a correlation. The researchers interpreted this to mean that a principal who demonstrated ability in

all 21 responsibilities would translate to a mean student achievement that is 10 percentile points higher than a school with a principal with average ability in the 21 responsibilities. The researchers discovered an effect size in some studies as high as .50 and as much as 19 percentile point increase in student achievement. Conversely, the researchers found that principals can also have a negative impact on achievement or a marginal impact as low as .02. The researchers concluded that two primary factors determine whether a leader will have a positive or negative impact on student achievement: the focus of change (identifying the particular practices a school body requires) and a proper understanding of the magnitude or order of change they are leading and adjusting practices accordingly. These findings have led to a seminal framework for understanding how leadership does in fact impact student achievement.

Research has indicated that the 21 responsibilities demand not only organizational intelligence from school leaders, but many of the competencies require EI to be able to identify the particular needs of students, teachers, staff, and school culture in order to implement and identify the change that is needed. EI presents a burgeoning leadership style in the field of education among other such leadership paradigms as transformational leadership, in which stakeholders and employees must be united toward a common vision (Berkovich & Eyal, 2017; Hitt & Tucker, 2016; Summers, 2015; Wang et al., 2016), and transactional leadership, in which leaders make exchanges with employees to achieve certain goals (Grunes, Gudmundsson, & Irmer, 2014; Segredo, 2014). Although the research focusing on the interactions between emotional competence and leadership styles or educational outcomes was mixed (Ashworth, 2013; Berry, 2013; Grunes et al., 2014; Hanlin, 2014), the literature indicated that more leaders and teachers became increasingly aware of the importance of EI in school organizations

(Akomolafe & Olatomide, 2013; Brinia et al., 2014; Grobler, 2014; Harney, 2015; Pierce, 2014; Segredo, 2014; Sun & Leithwood, 2015; Waters et al., 2003).

Principals' Emotional Intelligence and School Climate

School climate was found to impact student academic performance and achievement through its effects on physical and mental health, student perceptions of self-efficacy, absenteeism, dropout rates, motivation to learn, and mitigating the negative impact of socioeconomic factors on success, and more (Thapa, Cohen, Guffey, & Alessandro, 2013).

While it is taken for granted that school culture and climate directly impact student achievement, it has been less accepted that school leaders have a direct effect on student achievement (Ashworth, 2013; Berry, 2013; Grunes et al., 2014; Hanlin, 2014; Harney, 2015; Juma, 2013).

The link between the two has often been understood as indirect, given that the school administrator has the greatest effect over school culture and climate (Akomolafe & Olatomide, 2013; Brinia et al., 2014; Mak, 2014; Maulding, Peters, Roberts, Leonard, & Sparkman, 2012; Moore, 2009a; Waters et al., 2003). As such, the school leader's EI and its impact on the school culture as an indicator of potential student achievement has been given significant treatment in the literature. One such study was conducted by Harney (2015), who implemented a mixed-methods design to investigate the relationship between school principals' EI and how teachers perceived their school climate. The study compared the EI and school climate of American culture and South Korean culture. Five United States elementary, middle, and high schools in South Korea serving military children comprised the American sample, and five northwestern region schools comprised the South Korean sample. The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) was used to measure school principals' EI, and the Revised School Level Environment Questionnaire was used to measure school climate; quantitative data was

collected from each. Qualitative interviews followed up on the quantitative data. The quantitative results indicated no correlation between principals' EI and school climate in either American schools or South Korean schools. Contrarily, the qualitative findings indicated that American and South Korean principals implement EI to cultivate and sustain positive school climate. As principals described emotions they feel during positive and negative interactions, the themes of understanding and managing emotions emerged. A major cultural difference was found in how Korean principals felt responsible for the school's overall climate and serving the needs of all stakeholders, whereas American principals indicated administrators and teachers were collectively responsible.

In support of Mayer and Salovey (1990) and Goleman (1998), an emergent theme among principals was how relationships are necessary for improving and maintaining school climate. The principals even acknowledged their need to improve their emotional competence in managing emotions further by reading professional journals, observing other principals, and taking advantage of professional development opportunities. Overall, these themes contributed to what followers perceived as a positive school climate, which directly affects the student learning environment. The difference between the study's quantitative and qualitative results highlight the present study's research design's importance for exploring beliefs and perceptions through a qualitative design. Using a qualitative study supported the present study's qualitative design in uncovering perceptions, while the findings supported the present study's focus on cultivating EI as professional development for principals.

Consistent with Harney's (2015) qualitative results, Mak (2014) conducted a study including five male principals who were recipients of the Illinois High School Principal of the Year Award to examine to what extent EI has influenced their work as principals. Completing

the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal and a 60-minute follow-up interview, the principals indicated that their EI had a positive relationship with their success as leaders, with a particular strength being self-management, especially regarding self-management in controlling emotions and impulses. This was salient in their ability to lead with integrity and professionalism as well as treating confrontations or difficult conversations with faculty with dignity and respect. Emotional intelligence was also important when principals provided support to faculty during times faculty dealt with difficult parents, which helped cultivate teacher trust and buy-in. Findings indicated it was important for principals to earn the faculty's trust as well as demonstrate trust in faculty, which was a facilitator of collaboration and buy-in to school improvement plans.

Mak's (2014) findings reaffirmed those of the Consortium of Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago (2010), which also found a supportive school culture and environment headed by effective leaders to increase the likelihood of improving student learning regardless of school traits like class, race, gender, and location. Despite their strengths in leadership and collaboration, the researcher identified empathy, noting moods, picking up on nonverbal cues, and paying closer attention to feelings as weaknesses that these successful leaders could improve for stronger social and organizational awareness of the moving parts of a successful school environment. The researcher challenged the participants' notions of collaboration as building consensus and encouraged a new meaning of collaboration in which leaders are thoughtful and inclusive of competing priorities and varying commitment levels among teachers. Finally, Mak (2014) recommended professional development programs integrate EI into their curriculum to teach leaders to have more profound understanding of the stakeholders involved in improving the school in order to achieve that goal.

To examine teachers' and staff's perceptions of how principals' EI influenced the overall climate of the school, Juma (2013) conducted a descriptive qualitative case study with quantitative descriptive analysis of one Midwest public elementary school principal and the school staff and faculty. Four instruments including the Bar-On Emotional Quotient, which is frequently used in the literature, as well as the Inventory and Organizational Climate Questionnaire were used in addition to interviews. Emergent themes for the principal's EI included people skills, community building, purpose, coping with adversity, community, communication, professional development, motivation, and innovation. Juma used in-person interviews and online surveys to examine perceptions of one principal and 10 followers regarding how leadership's EI influences school climate. The researcher discovered that the principal's EI scores related to the organizational climate, especially in the school's emphasis on community, communication, collaboration, and school vision. In the principal's responses, the most frequently mentioned leadership quality was relationship building; appreciation was the most frequently mentioned characteristic regarding community. In followers' responses, the most frequently mentioned theme regarding community was teamwork as well as administrative support, sense of ownership, belonging, and feeling valued. Feeling valued was an indicator of having administrative support and related to the principal's appreciation of staff. The principal emphasized the significance of community and teachers supported this theme by identifying community involvement and engagement frequently in their responses. These findings support those of Harney (2015) and Mak (2014) in that EI was consciously practiced by leaders and acknowledged by staff as fostering a collaborative and supportive environment that was important for the school's performance.

Similarly, Brinia et al. (2014) sought to explore the views of primary school teachers and principals regarding the EI and leadership of principals. The researchers identified the impact of an emotionally intelligent principal by one's ability to inspire and facilitate a self-conscious school culture by implementing values of understanding, trust, prospect, achievement, and effectiveness. Furthermore, emotionally intelligent leaders do this while combining emotions, beliefs, and visions of stakeholders in a flexible manner. The researchers implemented a quantitative research design in which data was collected via questionnaires to assess the large anonymous sample of 301 teachers and 36 principals. Data analysis produced 10 essential factors for EI: the ease with which the principal builds friendly ties, the principal's impulsivity, how definitively the principal sets goals, the principal's confidence in situations, whether the principal can effectively communicate anger, whether the principal provides teachers aid, whether the principal likes helping others, whether the principal adopts changes in his or her daily life, whether the principal is satisfied with his or her appearance, whether principals face difficulties in disagreeing, and whether principals rely more on the ideas of others than their own. Six essential leadership factors included principals complying with a plan or system with the goal of school improvement, the extent principals control their school, to what extent principals listen attentively to teacher's ideas, and whether principals take the Parents' Council into consideration when planning. These findings regarding teacher and principal perceptions of and priorities for leadership show strong overlap with the Marzano et al. (2005) 21 responsibilities framework and give support to its leadership framework. The study supported strong correlation between the 21 responsibilities for leadership that improve student achievement and how essential EI is to fostering the leadership of stakeholders in school performance.

Brinia et al. (2014) defined an emotionally intelligent leader as one who combines the emotions and visions of stakeholders flexibly. This differs from the transformational leadership paradigm, which unites stakeholders to a common and shared vision and is a major leadership paradigm in the topic of school reform (Berkovich & Eyal, 2017; Summers, 2015; Wang et al., 2016). Wang et al. (2016) conducted a study that investigated possible associations between transformational leadership and emotional competence. In education literature, transformational leadership is formally understood to be leadership that mobilizes efforts to reform schools as educational organizations by moving followers' awareness past personal interests toward a shared organizational vision (Hitt & Tucker, 2016; Wang et al., 2016, p. 469). The researchers identified how fundamental behaviors of transformational leaders rely on EI and competence as evidenced in prior research. The study analyzed a sample of 20 administrators and 284 of their support staff and faculty. Administrators completed two self-assessments, with survey items adapted from the Widener Emotional Learning Scale (WELS) and the Survey of Transformational Leadership (STL). Faculty and staff completed two surveys also featuring WELS and STL items to assess their administrator. The findings indicated that the more leaders' self-assessment of emotional competence aligned with teachers' assessments of their emotional competence, the greater their degree of transformational leadership. Conversely, leaders who over-rated their transformational leadership correspondingly overestimated their emotional competence when scores were compared to their subordinates' ratings. The results showed that the accuracy or inaccuracy of self-assessments and perceptions of emotional competence had strong relation to the accuracy or inaccuracy of transformational leadership skills. The researchers concluded that the results had implications for how developing emotional competence may promote the development of transformational leadership. The results suggested

significant correlation between administrators' EI and followers' perceptions of transformational leadership skills.

Similarly, Segredo (2014) investigated the relationships between elementary school principals' leadership styles, their levels of EI, and the administrators' school culture. The researcher used a non-experimental ex-post-facto research design to survey a sample of 57 elementary school principals and 850 of their faculty members, all from a large urban school district in southeast Florida. Principals completed the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) while faculty completed the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ); responses to the MLQ served as a measure of school culture. The findings showed significant positive association between EI and leaders' idealized influence-attributes, idealized influence-behaviors, inspirational motivation, and contingent reward. Strong association was also found between school culture and transformational and transactional leadership measures. These results supported the previous research's findings that EI was a strong factor in effective leadership (Brinia et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2016). Conversely, negative associations were discovered between passive-avoidant leadership measures and the resulting school culture.

The findings are important for the present study in their recognition that emotional intelligence does not consist of merely recognizing followers' higher order needs, but that transformational and transactional leadership practices should also be employed for effective leadership. The researchers suggested that in these turbulent times of education in which external politics infringe on day-to-day school operations, principals should pay attention to the lower order needs of their followers and consider the use of transactional leadership elements, such as contingent rewards. These recommendations align with Marzano et al.'s (2005) 21 responsibilities framework and give insight for this present study's concern of developing EI in

school leaders. Although the present study does not focus on the transformational leadership framework explored by Segredo (2014) and Wang et al. (2016) in the context of EI, the present study is concerned with transformational leadership's underlying premise of working toward a shared vision of school reform and change. Therefore, these combined results were important for the present study in the indication that multiple leadership styles could still require a degree of EI, furthering the move from the managerial-style of administration to an emotional competence paradigm that was perceived by school leaders as a factor in school performance and reform.

Principals' Emotional Intelligence with Teachers

Thus far, the research indicated that school leaders and staff were aware of how leadership's EI significantly affected school culture, climate, and therefore performance. Given that researchers have acknowledged teachers as the strongest factor in student achievement, the EI of school leaders, as it related to interactions with faculty, was especially important for understanding how principals affect student achievement, as well. The increase in federal and state mandates, accountability measures and standardized testing, and teaching evaluations have resulted in increased "turmoil, resistance, stress, anger, frustration, and other emotions experienced during the process" of school reform (Moore, 2009a, p. 21). These issues only exacerbate already persistent stressors that may impact teachers' job satisfaction, including shrinking budgets, poor or inconsistent salaries, parents' attitudes, students' attitudes, hostile or unsupportive school environments, role conflict or ambiguity, undesirable teaching conditions, and teaching load (Akomolafe & Olatomide, 2013; Ju, Lan, Li, Feng, & You, 2015). Job satisfaction is integral to organizational commitment, especially toward a school wide goal such as reform, and teacher dissatisfaction is a contributor of turnover rates (Akomolafe & Olatomide, 2013; Craig, 2008). Lack of organizational commitment or job satisfaction among teachers can

compromise collective teacher efficacy (Craig, 2008; Gaddis, 2016; Pierce, 2014; Sun & Leithwood, 2015; Taliadorou & Pashiardis, 2015). Just as importantly, it can compromise the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Gaddis (2016) defined OCB as employee behavior that goes above and beyond the standard call of duty and is therefore not recognized in the organization's traditional reward structure. As such, the individual goes above and beyond the call of duty because they believe it to be the right thing to do. Like EI, the concept of OCB has persisted throughout the business and organization literature and is useful for understanding individuals' motivation in organizations like schools. OCB is particularly salient in schools given that education is a service industry in which the emotional and moral returns are greater than the financial ones (Gaddis, 2016). This call to the profession is important for retaining quality teachers, especially in the face of increasing external pressures and stress.

Job satisfaction, collective teacher efficacy, and organizational citizenship behavior highlight the importance of leadership's emotional competence for addressing and accommodating teachers' emotions and feelings, especially given their direct impact on student learning (Bedessem-Chandler, 2014; Berkovich & Eyal, 2017; Cliffe, 2011; Craig, 2008; Grobler, 2014; Pierce, 2014; Sun & Leithwood, 2015; Taliadorou & Pashiardis, 2015). Emotionally competent leadership has been found to positively impact job satisfaction. Craig (2008) defined emotionally intelligent principals as leaders attuned to others' and their own emotions. The researcher implemented a mixed-methods research design that analyzed the relation between the variables of principals' EI and teacher job satisfaction. The sample consisted of three public school principals, who were interviewed using a critical incident protocol that was then coded for emotionally intelligent behaviors, and 51 teachers from the same three public schools, who completed a section of the School and Staffing Survey that

measured teacher job satisfaction. The principals were found to demonstrate the emotional competencies of optimism, emotional self-awareness, empathy, and achievement orientation.

Factors contributing to teachers' job satisfaction included teachers' voices being heard and open lines of communication. Another significant factor was teachers' participation in decision-making in disciplinary policy and establishing curriculum, an autonomy and trust in teachers also supported by Mak (2014) and Berry (2015). These emotional competencies on the part of the principals were found to create resonance throughout the school with teachers and therefore improve their commitments toward collective school goals. This study's methodology supported the present study's research design, in that the qualitative method was used to discover behaviors and perceptions that could then be linked to EI competencies.

Similarly, Taliadorou and Pashiardis (2015) implemented a quantitative research design to investigate whether school principals' political skill (PS) and EI influence how they exercise leadership and their teachers' job satisfaction. Questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 182 principals and 910 teachers of Cyprus public elementary schools. Principals responded to questionnaires using two scales to measure EI and political capacity; teachers responded to questionnaires using two scales to measure leadership styles and job satisfaction. The results indicated a strong relationship between a principal's EI and PS; the researchers explained this may be due to the conceptualization of leadership as a process of social influence via which a leader may affect followers' perceptions, feelings, or behaviors, rendering emotional regulation inevitable for constructing positive social interactions. Therefore, the researchers proposed a combination of "emotional-political capacity" that principals should have to lead an organization through change and gaining the commitment of teachers.

This proposal was supported by the findings indicating that emotional-political skills influenced the principal's scope of action and were related to the construction of a positive public image through alliance building with external stakeholders. Finally, the results showed that principals with strong emotional-political competences affect teacher job satisfaction because they commit time to cultivating positive social relationships at work, demonstrate genuine concern for others, understand others, and build relationships within the workplace. When scope of leadership served as an intermediate variable, the positive correlation of teacher job satisfaction was shown to increase. Combined with Craig's (2008) results, the research has indicated the positive impact an emotionally competent principal can have on those agents directly tied to student learning.

Furthermore, the research has highlighted the importance of principal-teacher collaboration and collective teacher efficacy in driving such organizational goals as school reform and change. Given that collective teacher efficacy has been found to correlate strongly with school performance and student achievement, Pierce (2014) set out to examine the relationship between principals' EI and collective teacher efficacy as perceived and self-reported by teachers and principals. The sample consisted of 129 teachers and 13 principals from 13 Southern California elementary and secondary schools. To collect data, two questionnaires were used. The ESCI measured Goleman's (1998) four higher-order dimensions of EI through 12 individual competencies; one ESCI Likert-scale questionnaire for "self" and one for "others" were given to respondents. Collective teacher efficacy was measured with the CTBS to measure faculty's beliefs about collective ability for influencing student achievement via the two subscales of instructional strategies and student discipline; again, a Likert-scale questionnaire was used.

The results showed a positive relationship between principals' EI and collective teacher efficacy, in line with previous research (Pierce, 2014). The results produced few exceptions to the findings of EI competencies being highly correlated with one another, with total collective teacher beliefs, and with instructional strategies and student discipline. In line with previous research, the results indicate principals' EI plays a major role in supporting teacher coordination and identifying support structures that foster collective efficacy. The findings also identified that EI scores for influence (leader's ability to persuade in a variety of situations) and conflict management (leader's ability to understand conflicting viewpoints and acknowledge feelings on all sides while resolve disputes) were the best predictors of the total collective teacher belief score and instructional strategies score. Overall, the findings support a positive association between principals' EI as it affects collective teacher efficacy in instructional strategies and student discipline. Although the final sample was limited to elementary schools, these findings are relevant to the present study's focus on assessing and cultivating the EI of school leaders regarding improving student achievement. The researchers proposed further research should explore secondary school perspectives and qualitative designs for investigating perceptions of leader behavior (Pierce, 2014), which were the research methodology and research gap the present study sought to address.

Similarly, Gaddis (2016) conducted a quantitative study via surveys distributed to ten schools from a northwest Missouri school district to explore whether a principal's EI fosters teacher participation in organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Gaddis identified the importance of OCB in schools given that education is a service industry in which the emotional and moral returns are greater than the financial ones. This call to the profession is important for retaining quality teachers, especially in the face of increasing external pressures and stress. The

researcher understood leadership's EI to be significant in cultivating the motivation of teachers in fostering OCB and therefore a larger school culture of excellence and dedication. Therefore, Gaddis set out to measure the impact of leader's EI on followers' OCB by distributing Likert scale surveys using an emotional competency inventory of 3-5 colleagues of each school leader. Teachers were asked to assess the OCB of their school building faculty as a unit for a closer representation of actual OCB rather than the typically exaggerated self-assessments. The results indicated that the overall measure of a principal's EI did not significantly relate to teacher OCB. These results align with Sun and Leithwood's (2015) findings that teacher OCB is less malleable to principal behavior. Other competencies found to be negatively significant were emotional self-control, pattern recognition, and networking. The researcher explained that OCB is irrational and that its motivation is often unexplainable or idiosyncratic. Furthermore, a principal with too much emotional self-control may not demonstrate the necessary amount of emotion to develop a bond with teachers emotionally to incite OCB.

Although the findings seemed to contradict the literature, the researcher's interpretation of these findings is in line with previous research that indicates principals' need to be emotionally intelligent enough to be able to assess the degree of emotional interaction required by each teacher or staff member individually (Berry, 2015; Mak, 2014). Also in line with EI was the adverse impact principals' pattern recognition may have on OCB, in that pattern recognition may appear to rigid or analytical to demonstrate a need for OCB from teachers (Gaddis, 2016). Furthermore, the findings did indicate that teamwork, empathy, achievement orientation, and initiative demonstrated by principals were more likely to foster OCB, emphasizing the emotional connectivity and inspiration needed from principals to garner this positive culture and organizational commitment needed for school wide initiatives (e.g., reform), as seen throughout

the literature (Grobler et al., 2017; Juma, 2013; Kiel, Bezboruah, & Oyun, 2009; Mak, 2014; Pierce, 2014; Taliadorou & Pashiardis, 2015).

Impact of Principals' Emotional Intelligence on School Performance and Student Achievement

The research showed how principals affected those factors directly impeding or facilitating student achievement. As evidenced in the literature, teachers are the direct influencers of student learning, and teachers' job satisfaction in turn influences their individual efficacy (Akomolafe & Olatomide, 2013; Berry, 2015; Craig, 2008), their organizational citizenship behavior (Gaddis, 2016; Sun & Leithwood, 2015), and their collective teacher efficacy (Pierce, 2014; Taliadorou & Pashiardis, 2015). Furthermore, principals are held accountable for the school climate, culture, and environment (Harney, 2015; Moore, 2009a; Segredo, 2014), the teachers' perceptions which may be significantly impacted by principal-teacher relationships and therefore a principal's EI (Barnes, 2015; Brinia et al., 2014; Hanlin, 2014).

Therefore, the effect principals have on student achievement has been largely understood as indirect. Furthermore, the direct impact principals have on student achievement has been contested (Ashworth, 2013; Berry, 2013; Grunes et al., 2014; Hanlin, 2014; Harney, 2015; Juma, 2013). Much scarcer is the research that principals' EI directly has on student achievement, and the findings have also been mixed. The seminal work produced by Waters et al. (2003) that led to the 21 responsibilities framework identified 21 school leadership behaviors that in fact do directly impact student achievement and learning. Goodwin and Babo (2014) set out to rank order Waters et al.'s (2003) 21 responsibilities according to their impact on classroom instructional practices from the perspective of exemplary teachers nationwide. The researchers used a Likert scale questionnaire to collect data online from 178 elementary, middle, and high

school teachers across the 50 states who had been selected as National Teacher of the Year winners over the past six years. The results indicated the 93.8% of the respondents cited “Contingent Rewards” as very important, followed by “Relationships” at 85.4% and “Visibility” at 84.3%. More than 75% of teachers also cited “Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment,” “Intellectual Stimulation,” and “Optimizer” as very important. Very few behaviors were rated not important, only one of 178 teachers rated “Relationships” as not important, and none of the 178 teachers ranked “Contingent Rewards” and “Visibility” as not important. These findings align with Bedessem-Chandler’s (2014) findings, which resulted in “Relationships” and “Visibility” being ranked in the top-most important behaviors by teachers. From their own findings, Goodwin and Baba (2014) suggested that school boards interview stakeholders for which leadership traits they believe most important in leadership, and that principals model the traits most highly valued and perceived as effective. These findings are significant for developing leadership practices that Teachers of the Year have cited as facilitating effective classroom instruction. Therefore, the results were relevant to the present study in developing leadership practices by citing commonly successful traits of the 21 responsibilities that teachers endorsed as influential on student achievement.

Hanlin (2014) identified a gap in the literature regarding principals’ EI and its impact on student achievement. The researcher implemented a quantitative correlational research design to determine if there exists a correlation between practices of effective school leadership and EI. The study further sought to examine which tested leadership practices may have the greatest correlation to EI competencies. Data were collected from a two-part questionnaire based on Marzano et al.’s (2005) 21 responsibilities and Goleman’s (1998) four domains of EI. The survey used the Likert scale to determine to what extent 66 Maryland high school principals participate

in certain leadership practices and behaviors and to what extent they possess EI competencies. The results indicated a strong positive correlation (0.74) between high school principal's EI and research-based leadership practices. The findings also revealed that 55% of the variance in these administrators' leadership practices could be explained by and associated with their EI. The most significant relationships were found in the domains of self-monitoring and relationship management. In line with other research, communication and flexibility were among the 21 responsibilities related to EI. The researcher concluded that principals with stronger EI were more likely to practice research-based leadership behaviors. These findings contradict Grunes et al. (2014), who found that EI was not a significant predictor of transformational leadership or positive leadership outcomes. However, the results identifying perceived important leadership factors do align with Waters et al.'s (2003) landmark study of 21 responsibilities, which featured a significantly larger sample. Hanlin's (2014) study featured the EI context to these leadership competencies and suggested that emotional competence underlies a number of these 21 responsibilities affecting student achievement.

Ashworth (2013) also investigated the relationship between secondary public high school performance in relation to the EI of principals. The sample was drawn from Texas public schools serving students from grades 6 to 12 and consisted of 105 principals with at least 10 years of experience, serving in their current position for at least three years. Ashworth implemented an explanatory sequential mixed methods model for this correlational study. The quantitative results obtained from questionnaires showed no relationship of statistical significance between the administrators' EI and the school's performance. Nonetheless, qualitative data collected through two open-ended questions and a focus group produced two major themes of positive leadership: strong interpersonal and intrapersonal skills. These two themes are among Goleman's (2000) 19

EI competencies, namely in the fourth domain of relationship management. Principals believed that building relationships, motivation, inspiration, organizational skills, and communication skills were key factors that influenced school performance.

These factors also align with Marzano et al.'s (2003) categories of leadership responsible for student outcomes. Most significantly, the principals cited EI of self and others as important in change agency over time. Although the quantitative data revealed no statistical significance between secondary school principals' emotional competence and school performance, the qualitative data captured a phenomenon of beliefs that the secondary school principals held as change agents. The principals cited building relationships as the most important factor in a successful campus, and that it takes time to develop trust to foster such relationships. The results support the present study's choice of a qualitative research design for exploring the beliefs and perceptions of administrative stakeholders, while also supporting Goleman's (2000) theory and this study's framework of EI as a driver of strong school performance.

Barnes (2015) examined the influence of EI on administrative leadership in secondary schools. The researcher used a qualitative phenomenological narrative research design and a sample of eight Texas principals of high-performance Title I high schools. The results indicated that the eight principals strongly believed that EI informed an administrator's ability to navigate the demands of a Title I school. Furthermore, the principals actively exercised Goleman's (2000) personal competencies of self-awareness and self-management to handle their emotions in personal and professional conduct while implementing the social intelligences of social awareness and relationship management to motivate and bring the school community together harmoniously in a collaborative work environment that achieved academic success (Goleman, 2000). This study supported the present study's choice of qualitative research design to uncover

the beliefs principals have about EI and school management and understanding how they interpret their experiences with EI and school management. The findings also supported the body of research emphasizing the role that school leader's EI played in fostering a collaborative and harmonious environment among stakeholders to accomplish academic achievement and change for students. Here, school leaders considered social awareness and relationship management as a requisite for successful leadership.

Berry (2013) set out to investigate the influence of principal EI on school profile rank. The quantitative non-experimental cross-sectional research design was implemented to analyze differences that may exist between principals' self-reported EI according to the Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2004) EI Test and the Arizona Department of Education's (ADE) school profile rank. The sample consisted of 80 principals from public, non-charter, Arizona high schools participating in the AZ LEARNS evaluation system that awards points to schools based on their improvements in numbers of students passing AIMS academic excellence standards for the 2010-2011 school year. The ADE categories of schools included: Excelling, Highly Performing, Performing Plus, Performing, Underperforming, or Failure to Meet Academic Standards. Contrary to the amount of research linking leadership EI and behavior to positive organizational outcomes, the study found no significant difference among the high school principals' overall EI scores across the varying school performance categories. The researcher attributed this finding to the limited size of the sample as well as the homogeneity of MSCEIT scores and standardization behind school profile rank formulas. The researcher further proposed that education provides its own inherent variance, such as that among principal and teacher training, instructional resources, student demographics, and curriculum guides, that varies so much across schools that it becomes difficult to compare school profile ranks as they relate to principal EI. The findings did not align

with previous research linking high principal EI to greater school performance. For example, the results showed that principals from the “Performing” category had a significantly higher MSCEIT “Managing Emotions” score than those from the “Excelling” school rank category. The findings remained significant to the present study, in that these revealed the perceived importance of leadership EI across secondary schools regardless of school rank.

Similarly, Grunes et al. (2014) were interested in the body of literature that has found EI to produce transformational leadership in non-educational settings and sought to explore predictors of EI that led to transformational leadership in schools. The researchers used a quantitative design to survey Australian educational institutions and a sample of 144 school leaders and 432 raters of those leaders. As relevant to the present study, the researchers questioned whether the Mayer and Salovey (1990) model of EI had incremental validity above other predictors of transformational leadership and outcomes. The findings indicated that none of the EI variables outlined by Mayer and Salovey (1990) were predictors of any of the perceived leadership outcomes variables, such as satisfaction, effectiveness, and extra effort. Additionally, no EI variables were predictors of the contingent reward scale in terms of transactional leadership. The study concluded that EI may not be a significant factor when determining leadership positions with the Australian school administrative hierarchy. Furthermore, those with high scores in emotional competencies may not be recognized by the current frameworks for awarding career progression. Contrary to Grobler’s (2014) findings, no significant difference was found between females and males in EI scores. The researchers explained that personality factors did have some impact on outcomes and that openness and emotional stability were found to predict transformational leadership; therefore, these traits may be important for identifying transformational school leaders. Overall, however, the researchers concluded that EI was not a

useful predictor of either leadership style or perceived leadership outcomes. The study contributed to the body of research defining EI predictors and their boundaries. The findings were important for the present study, which sought to explore and develop the EI of school leaders as change agents.

The purpose of Block's (2014) study was to examine the EI and efficacy of high school principals. 47 principals and assistant principals as well as 49 teachers from South Dakota high schools completed the Assessing Emotions Scale (AES) and Principal Sense of Efficacy Scale (PSES). The results indicated that teachers who perceived their principals as emotionally intelligent also viewed them as efficacious. The findings showed that teachers with fewer years of administrative experience receive higher EI scores than those with more experience. Interestingly, the results indicated that both principals and teachers believed principals are least influential in students' standardized test achievement. However, the study's quantitative research design limited further information or explanation regarding this result. This limit supports the present study's qualitative research design, which may uncover perceptions of leaders' efficacy as it impacts student achievement and school performance and contribute to professional development of administrators. The researcher recommended training for administrators in EI and communication.

Similarly, Jahraus (2016) conducted a non-experimental quantitative study to examine possible correlations between an elementary school principal's EI and staff members' levels of academic optimism. Jahraus cited the findings of previous research that teachers' and stakeholders' optimism contributes to a positive school climate and culture, and therefore performance. The researcher identified administrators' EI as playing a significant role in building the optimism needed to drive a school through external pressures for accountability and achieve

high performance. The researcher used the Emotional Intelligence Self-Evaluation, the School Academic Optimism Survey, and fall reading and math assessments to collect data for a statistical analysis examining the relationship between principals' EI and academic optimism as well as principals' EI and student achievement. The study's sample included 36 public elementary school administrators and 30% of their staff from schools in Montana. The findings showed minor statistical significance and showed no significant correlation, if any, between the school leader's EI and student achievement or optimism. Interestingly, the results showed a negative correlation between principals' EI and staff's academic emphasis in that when a principal has a high level of emotional management, self-motivation, and empathy, faculty tended to place less emphasis on the academics taught at the school. The researcher explained this to mean that when a principal has a high level of emotional management, students in the school had a lower level of achievement. Conversely, when a principal has low level of emotional management, the students had higher levels of achievement. The researcher explained that these negative correlations were still small. The researcher explained the principals have relatively little direct interaction with individual faculty and students at the school, which could weaken any benefits that EI brings to optimism and achievement experienced at the school. Furthermore, the researcher cited other confounding factors, such as parental involvement, happenings in the school community, and federal and state policies, over which a principal with high EI may not have the power to overcome. The limited sample size should also be considered regarding the findings, as well as previous quantitative research designs' shortcomings in assessing EI perceptions (Harney, 2015).

Given that principals' impact on students and learning has largely been perceived as indirect, Sun and Leithwood (2015) implemented systematic review techniques to assess the

impact principals have on students when principals focus their improvement efforts on teacher emotions and habits that are known to impact classroom teaching and learning directly. The researchers implemented a mixed methods design consisting of meta-analysis, narrative review, and effect size summation and averaging of 40 studies. The researchers first identified four distinct teacher-related factors that significantly impact student learning, including teacher commitment, teacher trust in colleagues and superiors, collective teacher efficacy, and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). The results indicated that teacher commitment and collective teacher efficacy appeared more malleable to leadership influence than teacher trust or organizational citizenship behavior. The researchers also developed a “power index” to describe the relative potential impact of leader's attention to the four mentioned variables. In response to which of the variables leaders should act upon, the calculated power indices indicated leadership practices mediated by collective teacher efficacy, teacher commitment, and OCB have similar effects while the power index for teacher trust was much lower. Although the study analyzed only one model of school leadership to calculate leadership's impact on teacher emotions, the paper proposed a useful theory for understanding how principals may travel four paths of their teachers' emotions to influence student learning and achievement more directly. This study was relevant to the present study to develop emotionally intelligent leadership competencies in principals to influence student achievement.

Developing Principals' Emotional Intelligence

Moore (2009b) published some of the earliest work connecting the business industry's focus on EI in leadership with educational reform. School reforms themselves have been characterized by “turmoil, resistance, stress, anger, frustration and other emotions experienced during the process” (Moore, 2009b, p. 3). Given the potential emotions have for chaos and

disruption under the stress and pressures exacerbated by federal and state mandates, parents, and changing society and technology, EI has therefore become essential in a leader's repertoire of skills. In reviewing the literature to date, Moore (2009b) identified emotions as a source of information that could be used by leaders to build trust, cooperation, and empathetic relationships with employees to demonstrate social awareness and skill in addressing issues and solving problems. As seen in the previous literature, fostering trust in employees, cultivating a sense of community and ownership, and fostering a support system for faculty and staff in which faculty believed the principal was truly on their side have been significant factors in teacher buy-in improving school performance and reform initiatives (Ashworth, 2013; Barnes, 2015; Jahraus, 2016; Manahan, 2009; Pierce, 2014; Taliadorou & Pashiardis, 2015). A social awareness of staff's emotions and moods while under pressure from school reform initiatives can enable principals to more effectively support and coach staff through the process and achieve school wide community and collaboration (Moore, 2009a).

The literature was mixed regarding whether EI could be taught or trained. However, seminal theorist Goleman (1998, 2000) believed the fact that it could be taught was what differentiated EI from cognitive intelligence. Goleman (2000) addressed how EI is an ability that must be learned and, therefore, can be trained. Goleman (2000) revised his theory based on new developments in neuroscience that help to understand the four domains of EI as four distinct neurological mechanisms separate from cognitive ability, or IQ. In sum, Goleman (2000) argued that emotional responses and experiences can mold in the brain and EI can be learned. However, due to its difference from cognitive intelligence, Goleman (2000) advised that traditional modes of learning academic subjects or technical skills may not be best suited for developing emotional competence. This proposition suggests that traditional book learning or study is not enough to

cultivate EI; the research has supported the need for professional development to institute an active curriculum of EI into the school leadership programs.

Manahan (2009) sought to fill a gap in the literature regarding practices that effectively develop EI in school leaders. Specifically, the researcher investigated strategies a district leader may implement to cultivate a repertoire of EI skills in district principals. The sample consisted of one-high school district with 99% White faculty in a conservative community that embraces tradition and is reluctant to change within schools or community. An increasing population of Hispanic residents and generally increasing divide between the affluent and poor was the context for rapid changes taking place, for which the administrators needed to be equipped to address. The EI development protocol consisted of two sessions dedicated to establishing group norms collaboratively and monthly meetings for group discussions regarding experiences and processes to support adherence to agreed-upon norms. These collaborative discussions built trust, empathy, understanding, and communication channels. A survey was then distributed to local administrators to determine their perceived value of relationships, reflective practice, self-assessment, and self-awareness. A series of workshops then explored the impact of emotions and effective communication in the workplace and the connections between EI and effective leadership. The group brainstormed situations where administrative intervention would be required throughout the day; perceived conflicts included communication, parent demands, and lack of respect from parents, students, staff, and administrators. Finally, the researcher ensured that ample follow-up and support would be provided to administrators throughout the year to sustain motivation for EI practices. The overall results from the scores on the EQ-i Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory indicated an average increase of 4.5 EQ points for all categories and a six point increase in the total EQ category alone. The researcher acknowledged that his

position as executive director and mid-management within the district might have influenced results. Nonetheless, the study supported the body of research suggesting that EI could indeed be trained and provided a coaching model for achieving development of EI in school leaders that was pertinent to the present study.

Five years after Manahan (2009), Kearney, Kelsey, and Sinkfield (2014) measured the impact of targeted interventions on the EI of aspiring principals using a pre-test/post-test action research design that measured EI scores according to the Emotional Skills Assessment Process. The researchers' interventions were originally designed by Nelson and Low (2011) to increase leader's' EI competencies in the six domains of social awareness/active listening, anxiety management, decision-making, appropriate use of assertive behaviors, time management, and commitment ethic. The sample consisted of 31 leader preparation program students from a Texas public university. The 31 students were enrolled in principal internship courses and received a series of six interventions taken from Nelson and Low (2011). The findings showed that significant differences in anxiety management, decision-making, appropriate use of assertive behaviors, and commitment ethic did not yield significant differences between the experiment and control group. Significant differences between the groups were found for social awareness/active listening and time management. Citing Goleman's (1998) proposition that emotional competencies may be learned through awareness and practice, the investigators proposed further research pursue the piloting of programs and curriculum to target EI development in school administration programs. The study's mixed findings reflect the mix findings of the research regarding the ability to develop EI through training. The differences in findings might be attributed to different training methods. These results were relevant to the present study's concern for development of EI in school leaders.

Although EI training is widely popular in business and organizational literature, there has been a notable gap regarding the development of EI training for school leaders (Moore, 2009a). Ekegren and Dåderman (2015) conducted a study to examine if there existed a difference in the three types of leadership intelligence—spiritual, emotional, and rational—before and after completion of a leadership training course. The participants underwent Understanding Group and Leader (UGL) training, which emphasizes development of emotional rather than cognitive abilities in leadership. According to the researchers, UGL’s objectives include increasing one’s insight into his or her own personality, working with reflection about learning, and appreciating the need for varying management styles. Among the learning outcomes are skills in giving and receiving feedback, identifying and handling conflicts, communicating clearly and directly, understanding emotions and values as well as their impact on leadership, and recognizing different stages of an organization’s development. The Leadership Intelligence Questionnaire was used to assess spiritual, emotional, and rational intelligence via Likert-scale survey responses of 125 managers from a variety of sectors including public administration, industry, healthcare, computing and information technology, and education. Measurements were taken at Time 1 (before training), Time 2 (immediately after training), and Time 3 (six months after training). The results indicated that mean scale scores for spiritual, emotional, and rational intelligence were all significantly higher at Time 3 than Time 1 for the 25 participants who were able to be measured all three Times. The scores did not differ between Time 2 and Time 3, which the researchers interpreted as signifying stability in the training’s effectiveness.

Nafukho, Muyia, Farnia, Kacirek, and Lynham (2016) identified an ongoing gap in the EI literature regarding how to develop EI in practicing leaders. Furthermore, the researchers noted a controversy in the literature regarding whether EI can be developed through training, citing

studies by Groves, McEnrue, and Shen (2008), Pool and Qualter (2012), and Nelis, Quoidbach, Mikolajczak, and Hansenne (2009) that supported increased EI through training, and citing a study by Muyia and Kacirek (2009) that found no significant difference in EI after training. The researchers therefore conducted a quantitative study consisting of a sample of 38 non-governmental leaders. The leaders participated in a five-day training workshop focused on Goleman's (1998) four domains of EI. The leaders participated in individual coaching sessions with the EI assessment taken at the beginning of the training and opportunities to receive extra coaching from professionals on the results after the training. EI scores equated to levels of "enhanced," "effective," "consider developing," and "developing." The results indicated growth in all five EI dimensions of intrapersonal, interpersonal, adaptability, stress management, and general mood. The highest growth was found in interpersonal, followed by general mood, adaptability, and total EQ. Stress management showed the least growth. Given that this study was contextualized for EI in business and industry, the research gap regarding the development of EI in educational and school leaders was even wider. The findings did show promise for the ability to develop leaders' EI through effective training and coaching.

Given the dearth of literature regarding the professional development of emotional training in school leaders, Kiel et al.'s (2009) study on a doctoral program for Public Administration leadership provided useful insight on a curriculum for developing EI in leaders through incorporating EI training in leaders' professional development programs. The researchers employed five pedagogical tools for EI training. The first was reciting a poem to fellow classmates, exercising the EI elements of eliciting emotions in others and opening up to them. The second was completing an EI instrument. The third tool was completing a life-orientation (LIFO) instrument to understand each student's worldview and how each resolve life

changes as well as assess behaviors that impact individual and group productivity. The first and third tool provided a forum for exchange feedback among students. The fourth pedagogical tool required students to complete the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire and again to exchange feedback to student teams. The final tool, which culminated all previous tools, was the design of a portfolio and personal leadership-development plan incorporating areas for personal development. The researchers noted that many of these tools, particularly the poem recitation, incited passion and motivation for research and engagement from the students. The results from the training indicates that these doctoral students of public administration leadership expressed they had an evidenced-based plan for their personal leadership development, students gained the experience to develop plans for their followers and employees as needed in the organization, and students had an inclination to use these skills as human resource selection tools to the benefit of the organization's' performance and productivity. This emotional-intelligence programming, although provided for leaders in public administration, is not so specific as to not be applicable to school leaders. The MFLQ also addressed elements of transformational leadership, a style of leadership that has been significant in education literature and reform (Berkovich & Eyal, 2017; Grunes et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2016). A commonality this training shared with that outlined by Manahan (2009) and Yamamoto et al.'s (2013) qualitative examination of high school principals' perceived EI (2013) was the vulnerability and open communication that fostered support networks and a confidence in collaboration required for a strong organizational culture. This study provided one means of an EI curriculum that fostered emotional competencies in leaders, while also equipping them with tools for implementing these vertically toward staff and the larger organizational culture.

Chapter Summary

During this era of accountability and standardized testing, schools have been inundated with reform models that seek to increase student achievement. However, without effective leadership at the school level, most of these reform efforts will likely fail (Lingam & Lingam, 2015). Accordingly, research indicates that effective leadership plays a significant role in student achievement and that a large determinant of effective leadership is EI (Kouzes & Posner, 2012; Moore, 2009b). In an effort to find a solution to the problem and equip school leaders for the mounting challenges of accountability and external pressures—and the corresponding internal challenges of teacher satisfaction and collective teacher efficacy—leadership preparation programs, school systems, and researchers alike have studied behaviors and practices that significantly impact leadership success and student achievement (Waters et al., 2003). After reviewing years of documented failed attempts of reforming schools, Moore (2009b) asserted there might be a strong indication that many leaders might not be skilled enough to deal with the emotions and conflicts associated with school reform or to be effective change agents. Due to the high level of human interaction found within educational institutions, it was of great importance to examine the effects of EI on leadership performance.

Interestingly, in a number of quantitative studies, few if any statistically significant correlations were found between school leaders' EI and student achievement or educational outcomes (Ashworth, 2013; Grunes et al., 2014). However, nearly all qualitative studies reviewed in this chapter found that EI was perceived by both principals and teachers as essential in school relationships, culture, environment, and collective performance. These contradictions were more surprising in mixed-methods studies whose quantitative results indicated little significance, but whose qualitative results showed stakeholders' strong cognizance of the

importance of leaderships' EI to school management (Ashworth, 2013). Overall, such findings emphasized the importance of a qualitative research design, as proposed by the present study for achieving its goal of exploring perceptions and beliefs of EI and behaviors of school leaders. Even more important were how qualitative studies have consistently shown leaders to have favorable and strong perceptions of EI guiding their everyday work and, for some, success (Hanlin, 2015; Harney, 2015; Mak, 2014; Maulding et al., 2012).

Although it was contested whether EI can be trained (Kearney et al., 2014; Nafukho et al., 2016), the positive results from leaderships' EI have been manifest, and researchers have recommended prioritizing EI in leadership curriculum and professional development programs (Kearney et al., 2014; Maulding et al., 2012; Moore, 2009b; Yamamoto et al., 2013). In Harney's (2015) study, the principals acknowledged their own EI had influence over their relationships and school climate and furthermore recognized their need to improve their emotional competence in managing emotions by reading professional journals, observing other principals, and taking advantage of professional development opportunities. Hanlin (2014) found that principals with stronger EI were more likely to practice research-based leadership behaviors. EI curriculum has been developed for leadership programs of service industries like education and public administration. Ekegren and Dåderman (2015) found certain training to be long lasting and stable; Manahan (2009) and Kiel et al. (2009) found promising EI development programs the participants deemed successful. However, Kearney et al. (2014) and Nafukho et al. (2016) discovered mixed results, some of which were attributed to the method of training. Nonetheless, EI was found to ground other effective leadership paradigms (Brinia et al., 2014; Bumphus, 2008; Maulding et al., 2012; Segredo, 2014; Wang et al., 2016) and was even recommended by

stakeholders to be screened at the hiring of new administrators (Dös & Savaş, 2015; Goodwin & Baba, 2014).

Although these recommendations for journals, curriculum, coaching, meetings, and activities have proven useful, action research and results regarding the potential for developing school leaders' EI remained mixed, incomplete, and scarce. How to develop EI in school leaders to achieve school wide reforms and high student achievement therefore remained to be investigated. It was the aim of the present study to explore principals' perceptions of how EI informed their work and school's student achievement for insight into such professional development of school leaders' EI. This chapter concluded the review of the literature regarding the significance EI in school leadership had for school reform. Chapter 3 will outline the methodology for the present study's qualitative exploration of the effects of EI on school leadership practices.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Chapter 3 details procedures and design for a qualitative research study that seeks to gain an understanding of the practices of school leaders and the role of EI in their work. The critical importance of effective school leadership and the knowledge that EI influences leadership were the motivation for this study. In an effort to understand each participant's lived experience, they were asked to respond to questions and describe their experiences. Therefore, this chapter includes the research questions, research design, participant information, instrumentation, and data collection procedures.

Research Questions

Labby, Lunenburg, and Slate (2012) noted that minimal attention has been given to the study of school leaders EI skills even though there is a great deal of interaction between leaders and stakeholders. The relationships that were created through these interactions influenced the experiences and daily school climate of teachers, students, and other stakeholders because the leader was responsible for creating a positive environment and setting the tone for the building. Given the demand for highly skilled school leaders, it was paramount to this study to show a link between school leadership and EI. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the practices of school leaders and the role of EI in their work in establishing a school culture. The research questions were developed using Goleman's (1998) theory of EI and work of Marzano et al. (2005) on research-based leadership practices that impact student achievement. The following research questions guided this study:

Research Question 1

How do school leaders view the role of emotions in the execution of their duties?

Research Question 2

What characteristics of emotional intelligence do school leaders report when they describe their leadership practices?

Research Question 3

How do teachers report that school leaders use emotional intelligence when faced with challenges?

Research Design

Qualitative research procedures were employed for this study to examine the practices of school leaders and the role of EI in their work. Qualitative research is a method for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem (Creswell, 2014). The research method is grounded in the idea that knowledge is constructed as people participate in and make meaning of an activity, experience, or phenomenon (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). It is often characterized by four traits: a focus on process, understanding, and meaning; the researcher is the primary instrument of data collection and analysis; utilizing an inductive process; and the product is richly descriptive (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

In this study, the researcher served as the primary instrument of data collection and analysis. The researcher conducted semi-structured face-to-face interviews with each school leader and teachers who worked with each school leader. The researcher then analyzed the data to determine the emerging themes. Data were then written into a richly descriptive narrative form including quotes from the research participants to give voice to the participants.

Qualitative data, with its emphasis on people's lived experiences, are well suited for locating the meanings people place on the events, processes, and structures of their lives and for connecting these meanings to the social world around them (Miles et al., 2013). Patton (2015)

noted the purpose of conducting interviews was to get data on phenomena that one could not observe, such as feelings, thoughts, and intentions. Participants seemed to reflect on the questions when responding in order to provide thoughtful answers. In this regard, qualitative methods were appropriate to gain insight into the events, processes, and structures that school leaders encountered as they enacted leadership practices. To this end, semi-structured face-to-face interviews were conducted with four school leaders and analyzed for common themes.

This study also utilized four focus groups consisting of teachers who worked with each of the school leaders. This research method allowed the researcher to probe participants' responses utilizing follow-up questions to gain further insight regarding the research topic. In this study, school leaders and the teachers they supervised were asked to communicate their lived experiences and reflect on the extent to which EI impacted the practices of the school leaders. Another form of data, document review, was gathered from the review of documents. Document review enabled the researcher to compare and verify information provided by the participants during the semi-structured face-to-face interviews. In this study, triangulation occurred using multiple streams of data which included a demographic survey with four open-ended questions, a card sorting activity, semi-structured face-to-face interviews with school leaders, and focus group interviews, as well as member checks, which allowed participants an opportunity to read their transcripts for accuracy and to determine if the ideas, behaviors, and self-reported events were accurate depictions of their lived experiences.

Participants

Sample selection in qualitative research is commonly nonrandom, purposeful, and small in contrast to more random, larger sampling procedures often found in quantitative research (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). For this study, the researcher interviewed four school leaders in

the southeastern region of the United States. This population was actively engaged in daily leadership activities that required interactions that influenced the work of various stakeholders. These interactions allowed dialogue regarding the stresses that accompanied school reform and the role of EI in each leader's practices while guiding reform efforts.

The researcher utilized the technique of criterion sampling. With criterion sampling, all participants must meet criterion; for this study, criteria were determined to ensure a level of depth to interview responses. Study participants were selected based on three criteria: They worked in a school leadership capacity as a principal. Second, participants must have worked in a leadership capacity for a minimum of five years. Third, participants demonstrated a willingness to participate in this study.

Other participants in the study were teachers supervised by each of the identified leaders. The researcher secured a list of staff members from each school leader who agreed to participate in the study. Staff members were asked to self-identify if they worked with the leader for a minimum of two years and contact the researcher via email or phone to confirm consent to participate in the study. Five staff members of each school leader were invited to participate in a focus group interview (Appendix D) to solicit responses about the practices of the school leader. When the researcher could not secure five staff members, the researcher scheduled the focus group interview and continued to solicit participation from staff members. These participants were well suited to provide data about their leader's EI because they experienced it regarding the purpose and work of the team.

Recruitment

A total of 12 high school principals were employed in the study school district during the 2017-2018 school year; eight of those principals met the identified study criteria for school

leaders at the onset of the school year. The researcher attempted to contact all eight principals who had at least five years of leadership experience and served as a principal. The researcher sought to collect data from five high school principals and five teachers who had worked with each high school principal during the 2017-2018 school year. The researcher emailed a letter of invitation to each principal who met the criteria. After waiting for a period of one week, the researcher followed up with another email and called the school leader to schedule a recruitment meeting. The researcher continued recruitment efforts for a period of eight weeks. The recruitment procedure was completed with all eight principals. Obtaining consent from the possible participants was difficult. One principal initially agreed to participate and later declined. Additionally, three individuals did not answer or respond to either the researcher's emails or phone calls. As a result, this study was limited to four school leaders. After obtaining school leader consent, the researcher secured a list of staff members from each school leader who worked with each principal and solicited participation by emailing letters of invitation. The researcher asked staff members to self-identify if they met the study criteria by contacting the researcher by email or phone. The researcher secured four teachers who worked with Leader 1 to participate in focus group 1 and five teachers for each of the remaining focus groups who worked with each of the remaining school leaders to conduct the focus groups.

Data Sources

In qualitative studies, multiple forms of data are generally utilized (Creswell, 2014). Common collection procedures included various types of interviews and document review. Data collection from different sources was important to provide a comprehensive perspective. The principals' statements from the semi-structured face-to-face interviews, coupled with their responses from demographic questionnaires, and card sorting activities, and the responses of the

focus group participants enabled the researcher to collect a holistic and rich description of the role of EI on leadership practices (Miles et al., 2013).

Interviews

The researcher used semi-structured open-ended interview questions to solicit responses regarding the practices of school leaders and the role of emotional intelligence in their work in establishing a school culture. Open-ended questions allowed the researcher to guide the discussion while allowing participants to share as much information as they wanted. A key benefit of using the semi-structured interview was its attention to the lived experience of the participants, while attending to theoretical variables of interest, according to Galletta (2013). Semi-structured face-to-face interviews also allowed the researcher to respond to the participants' ideas and experiences regarding their leadership practices and the use of EI as they emerged and to ask probing questions (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). This method of data collection proved advantageous in collecting data about phenomena that were not easily observed, such as respondents' beliefs, attitudes, and inner experiences (Gall et al., 2007). It was also suitable to utilize interviews when there was an interest in past events that cannot be replicated (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Semi-structured face-to-face interviews allowed the researcher to obtain data from school leaders about past events and experiences related to the leadership practices of the leaders that could not be replicated. The researcher's objective was to solicit responses related to the role of emotional intelligence in the work of school leaders in establishing a school culture; therefore, the open-ended interview questions were aligned to the research questions that guided the study. The interview protocol (Appendix K) was peer reviewed by P-12 educators and amended based on feedback to ensure validity. Varying types of interview questions were asked of the population, including background and demographic, knowledge, experience or behavior,

and opinion or values questions. Each question was worded as concisely as possible to facilitate the participants' ability to generate rich data and align to the research question.

Focus Groups

This study also employed focus groups to gather data through a group discussion. Focus groups are frequently used as measures of yielding conversation and discussion about specific topics (Krueger & Casey, 2009). Focus group interviews enable researchers to acquire insight into how participants think (Krueger & Casey, 2009). The main objective of focus group interviews is to describe and understand meanings and interpretations of a particular group of people to gain an insight of a particular issue from the perspective of the participants of the group (Liamputtong, 2011). Another principal goal of the focus group interview is to help the participants feel comfortable to share opinions and beliefs without fear of being judged or ridiculed (Liamputtong, 2011). The success of the focus group discussion hinges on the establishment of a nonjudgmental and nonthreatening atmosphere where participants are comfortable with sharing their opinions and experiences without fear of judgment or ridicule (Liamputtong, 2011).

Under the guidance of a moderator, focus group participants were encouraged to share their thoughts, perspectives, and experiences in non-threatening environments. The researcher prepared to moderate the focus group discussions by researching focus group procedures. The researcher then served as the moderator of each focus group by asking participants open-ended questions. Focus group interviews were conducted at the schools of the participants after work hours in a conference room to ensure participant confidentiality. Focus groups normally include 4 to 8 participants who have a common characteristic that connect them. In this study, membership on a specific team was the common characteristic. As previously indicated, the

researcher secured four teachers who worked with Leader 1 to participate in Focus Group 1 and five teachers for each of the remaining focus groups who worked with each of the remaining school leaders to conduct the focus groups.

This data collection method enabled the researcher to gather several perspectives simultaneously. Krueger and Casey (2009) noted that it was appropriate to use focus groups when the following occurred:

1. The researcher looked for a range of ideas or feelings that people had about something.
2. The researcher wanted ideas to emerge from the group. A group possessed the capacity to become more than the sum of its parts, to exhibit a synergy that individuals alone did not possess. (Krueger & Casey, 2009, p. 19)

The dialogue, debate, and group dynamics of participants enabled the researcher to garner information-rich data and important themes that might not have occurred in a one-on-one interview. For example, focus groups participants often responded to each other's ideas and experiences. Focus groups serve as a catalyst for the discovery of similar lived experiences and perceptions among group members. Regarding this study, a range of perspectives from the focus group participants regarding the leader's EI was valuable in determining its effect on leadership practices. Focus group participants had knowledge of how each of their school leaders reacted to the stressors associated with leading school reform efforts and thereby were able to share how their leaders used EI when faced with these challenges.

Cheng (2014) stated focus group interviews should comply with specific principles, such as the following:

1. Questions are understandable by participants.

2. Questions are clear and simple.
3. Questions are as colloquial as daily conversations.
4. Questions can be easily recited.
5. Questions should be open-end. (p. 383)

Cheng (2014) also noted that the focus group interviews should be organized to establish participants' connection with the topic. Cheng advised that focus group questions should progress from introductory questions to more specific questions intended to focus participants on the research question(s).

This study used questions that were worded clearly to ensure these were easy to understand. The researcher restated or repeated questions as needed. Research questions were peer reviewed by P-12 professionals. Questions were developed to elicit conversational dialogue that encouraged participants to elaborate on the practices of the school leaders. The researcher used language that was familiar to focus group participants due to their backgrounds in education. Interview protocols (Appendix L) began with questions that asked participants to discuss general aspects of leadership and led into more specific topics, such as how their leaders reacted to the stressors of school reform.

Document Review

Although semi-structured face-to-face interviews were the primary method of data collection, the researcher also collected and reviewed documents. Review of the data found in the documents allowed the researcher to note the most enacted leadership responsibilities and aided in the triangulation of data. Data from the document review allowed the researcher to compare participants' interview responses. These data also assisted the researcher in developing follow-up interview questions.

The initial document review consisted of data collected from multiple sources. The first was demographic data collected through an online survey provider (Qualtrics). This demographic survey also included four open-ended questions that were based on the EI framework and the intent to collect specific information regarding prior leadership experience.

Another document was created from the principals' responses to a card-sorting activity (Appendix J) that was administered prior to participating in the interview. While the researcher was present in the room during this activity, no interaction between the researcher and the participants occurred. This activity entailed sorting 21 cards, each of which represented one of the Marzano et al.'s (2005) 21 leadership responsibilities, into three piles: *(1) Most Frequently Used*, *(2) Used to a Certain Extent*, and *(3) Rarely Used*. In addition to the semi-structured face-to-face interviews, the purpose of this task was to determine which of the 21 leadership responsibilities were reported as commonly used as school leaders perform their daily tasks.

Boggan (2014) utilized a similar card sorting activity when he conducted his study to determine how principals enacted leadership responsibilities in focus and priority schools in Michigan. Principals were given 21 cards that represented each of the 21 leadership responsibilities identified in the work of Marzano et al. (2005). Boggan (2014) conducted a qualitative study that included ten principals. Data collection in his study consisted of interviews with the ten principals, a daily checklist that required principals to indicate which leadership responsibilities they performed each day, and the card sorting activity. Principals were given the stack of 21 cards and asked to group the responsibilities in categories to indicate how often each was regularly used. Categories included the same ones as this study. This method of data collection allowed Boggan to administer the leadership inventory activity prior to beginning the interview with the principals.

Because of the focus of the current study (i.e., examining the role of EI on leadership practices), the researcher determined it was appropriate to collect data regarding the leadership practices of school leaders utilizing the same data collection method as part of the triangulation of data for the study. Utilizing the card sorting leadership inventory allowed the researcher to gather data about the leadership practices that the school leaders implemented as they executed their duties.

Data Collection

After receiving approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Georgia Southern University to conduct the study, the researcher applied to conduct the study through the school district's Department of Research and Evaluation. After receiving the names of the school leaders, the researcher contacted the prospective school leaders to issue letters of IRB approval and provide information regarding the nature of the study, their role in the study, confidentiality, and contact information (Appendix B). The IRB letter outlined the method of data collection and analysis. After the researcher determined which school leaders were willing to participate in the study, participants were asked to sign an informed consent (Appendix C). The participants either returned the informed consent through email or provided a hard copy to the researcher. Upon returning the consent form, a questionnaire with demographic information and four open-ended questions was emailed to the leaders for completion prior to conducting the interview. Answers from each questionnaire were used to design specific interview questions for each of the four school leaders. The researcher reviewed the participants' responses and identified areas that could provide further data regarding how the past experiences of the leaders influenced their leadership practices and the role of emotions in their work and developed open-ended questions that would allow participants to share further information.

Semi-structured face-to-face interviews were important as a primary data collection tool because they provided robust information for the study, which included specific examples of instances that leaders were able to recount in great detail. The researcher and each participant selected a mutually agreed on time and place to conduct an interview. Each interview occurred in a conference room that was conducive to privacy and minimal disruptions. Each school leader was informed of the audio recording devices that were used to create a record of the meeting. The school leaders were asked to reflect on their experiences and the role of emotions in their work. These reflections were recorded electronically during the interview and transcribed for analysis.

The researcher secured a list of staff members from each leader who agreed to participate in the study. Staff members who worked with each leader a minimum of two years were asked to self-identify and respond to the researcher via email or phone to indicate consent to participate in the study. The potential participants were notified of the steps that the researcher took to protect their confidentiality. The following represented what was done to ensure confidentiality:

1. Access to digital audio files was password protected with a secure passcode.
2. Pseudonyms were assigned for each participant in the study, as well as for each school.
3. Recording devices were kept locked in secure file cabinet in the researcher's home.
4. Focus discussion transcriptions were secured on the researcher's personal computer with password protection to prevent unauthorized users.
5. Files, notes, and transcriptions would be destroyed after three years.

After determining which teachers were willing to participate in the study, the researcher and participants selected a mutually agreed on time and conference room to conduct the focus

group. Participants were asked to sign an informed consent form (Appendix E). The researcher served as the moderator of the group by taking notes and making observations during the focus group. Each interview occurred at the schools of the participants after work hours in a conference room to ensure participant confidentiality and minimal disruptions. The researcher read introductory comments to the focus group participants prior to asking interview questions. Participants were informed of the audio recording devices that were used to create a record of the meeting. The researcher ensured the participants understood their rights, and their identities would not be revealed in any reports by reviewing the focus group informed consent prior to asking questions from the focus protocol. The researcher also reviewed the group norms and reminded participants that they did not have to respond to any question they did not feel comfortable answering. Focus group members were also reminded to maintain equity of voice and allow each member to share information without judging each other. The time frame allotted for each focus group was 90 minutes to 2 hours. The participants were asked to reflect on their experiences and the role of emotions in the work of the school leaders. These reflections were recorded electronically during the interview and transcribed for analysis. The researcher requested permission to contact focus group members for clarification at a later time if needed.

Data Analysis

Creswell (2014) contended data analysis was accomplished in six stages: (a) organizing and preparing the data; (b) reading through the data; (c) beginning the process of coding the data into brackets or chunks; (d) using the coding process to generate a description of the setting, people, categories, or themes; (e) advancing how the description of themes will be represented in the qualitative narrative; and (f) interpreting the data. Creswell has also noted that although data analysis did occur in stages, the process did not always follow a linear approach. He suggested

that the process was more of a spiral, with the stages being interrelated and not always occurring in a prescribed order.

The researcher began the data analysis process by becoming familiarized with all of the data that were collected. Semi-structured face-to-face interviews with school leaders and focus groups were recorded to give the researcher accurate recordings of the interview data. The researcher transcribed the interview data and utilized the inductive data analysis process, outlined by Creswell (2014), to identify common themes that emerged. This process entailed listening to the interview recordings and reading the interview transcripts multiple times. Open coding was used to break the data down into words or phrases. Open coding allowed the researcher to explore, compare, and contrast identified patterns within transcripts as they appeared. Notations were made in the margins in the form of short phrases to record ideas that the researcher identified while reading the data. The researcher assigned a descriptor or code to each unit to classify the emerging ideas. This process provided a method to dissect the data for further analysis. The researcher then grouped the initial codes into categories by noting significant quotes or experiences. Lastly, the researcher developed themes that expressed the content of each group and compared the statements, experiences, and perceptions of all the participants to identify and highlight any common themes that emerged from any participants. Data were then written into a descriptive narrative form.

Instrument Reliability and Trustworthiness

Validity, one of strengths of qualitative research, was achieved by determining the accuracy of findings from the perspective of the researcher, the participant, or the readers of the account (Creswell & Miller, 2000). One method of checking validity was to employ the strategy of member checking, which safeguarded against researcher bias. The procedure afforded

participants an opportunity to review transcripts and findings to verify accurate reporting and provide additional information (Creswell, 2014).

For this reason, the researcher used member checking to validate data. Interview transcripts were issued within 48 hours to corresponding participants for confirmation and clarification. Participants verified the accuracy of the transcripts and did not request any amendments. The researcher also utilized peer debriefing as a method of ensuring validity. A peer reviewer provided an objective assessment of the data analysis. The peer reviewer examined and challenged the conclusions interpreted from the data analysis process. This process further added to the validity of this study. The peer reviewer assessed the transcripts over a period of four days for emerging themes. The reviewer looked for themes that the researcher may have overlooked. For example, when reviewing the transcripts the peer reviewer noted focus group responses identified instances in which leaders not only used conflict management to resolve issues amongst staff members, but also instances in which the leader had to resolve issues of resistance between the leader and staff members.

Limitations

Because this research was conducted only within a specific geographical region, it could be argued that school leaders might not be as willing to participate in the study for fear of being identified and receiving negative feedback. School leaders who perceived that they had low levels of EI might elect not to participate in the study.

Delimitations

The researcher chose to use data only from school leaders in the southeastern region of the United States due to the ease of collecting data. The small sample size of four school leaders also

delimited the study and did not produce findings that could be generalized to a larger population. In addition, the researcher only used data collected during the 2017 to 2018 school year.

Chapter Summary

This study focused on the role of EI on school leadership practices. A qualitative methodology was employed for this study. The participants were school leaders and teachers they work with. Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the Georgia Southern University's IRB, as well as the school district, and participants signed documents of consent prior to participating in the study. Data were collected using a semi-structured interview protocol that allowed the researcher to gain insight in the lived experiences of the school leaders and teachers. The researcher ensured the confidentiality of study participants by using pseudonyms for both the participants and the schools at which they worked. Utilizing a qualitative approach to collecting data allowed the researcher to gather data about past events related to the leadership practices of school leaders. The data sources for this study included a demographic survey with four open-ended questions, a card sorting activity, semi-structured face-to-face interviews with school leaders, and focus group interviews with the teachers that each school leader supervised. This triangulation of data was important to ensure that data sources converged as the researcher attempted to examine the role of EI in the work of school leaders.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine the practices of school leaders and the role of emotional intelligence in their work in establishing a school culture. Chapter 4 includes a description of the relevant demographic characteristics of the school leaders who participated in the study, a description of the procedure used to analyze the data, a presentation of the results (organized by research question), and a summary of the results.

Research Questions

Three questions were used to guide the study, including:

Research Question 1

How do school leaders view the role of emotions in the execution of their duties?

Research Question 2

What characteristics of emotional intelligence do school leaders report when they describe their leadership practices?

Research Question 3

How do teachers report that school leaders use emotional intelligence when faced with challenges?

Demographics

Four school leaders participated in one-on-one semi-structured face-to-face interviews and completed surveys. Personal demographic information was collected from school leaders through an online survey instrument. Table 3 indicates the relevant demographic characteristics of the four school leaders who provided one-on-one interview responses and survey data.

Table 3

School Leader Demographic Characteristics

Participant	Gender	Age	Ethnicity	Education	Years of school leadership experience
Leader 1	Female	44	African American	Master's	6
Leader 2	Male	44	African American	Doctorate	6
Leader 3	Male	48	African American	Specialist	13
Leader 4	Female	60	African American	Doctorate	12

In addition to conducting semi-structured face-to-face interviews and collecting survey responses from four school leaders, the researcher conducted focus groups with subordinates of each of the leaders for a total focus group number of 19. Personal demographic information was not collected from focus group participants. Each participating subordinate had at least two years of experience in working with the leader. Table 4 indicates the number of subordinates who participated in each focus group.

Table 4

Number of Focus Group Participants

Focus group	Number of participants
Leader 1 Focus Group	4
Leader 2 Focus Group	5
Leader 3 Focus Group	5
Leader 4 Focus Group	5

Table 5 depicts the results of the card-sorting activity, in which school readers rated the frequency with which they fulfilled Marzano research-based responsibilities. Frequency of

responsibility fulfillment was rated on a three-level scale, with levels including: (1) rarely used; (2) used to a certain extent, and; (3) most frequently used.

Table 5

School Leaders' Self-Assessed Frequency of Fulfillment of Marzano Research-Based Responsibilities (Card-Sorting Activity Results)

Marzano research-based responsibility	Frequency of activity				Mean
	Leader 1	Leader 2	Leader 3	Leader 4	
1. Affirmation	2	2	2	3	2.25
2. Change Agent	3	2	1	2	2
3. Contingent Reward	3	2	2	3	2.5
4. Communication	3	3	3	3	3
5. Culture	3	3	2	3	2.75
6. Discipline	3	3	3	3	3
7. Flexibility	3	3	3	2	2.75
8. Focus	2	2	2	3	2.25
9. Ideals/Beliefs	3	3	3	3	3
10. Input	3	3	3	2	2.75
11. Intellectual Stimulation	3	2	2	3	2.5
12. Involvement in curriculum, instruction, and assessment	2	2	2	2	2
13. Knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment	3	3	3	3	3
14. Monitoring/Evaluating	3	3	2	3	2.75
15. Optimizer	2	2	2	2	2
16. Order	3	2	3	3	2.75
17. Outreach	3	3	3	2	2.75
18. Relationship	2	3	2	3	2.5
19. Resources	3	2	3	2	2.5
20. Situational Awareness	3	2	3	3	2.75
21. Visibility	3	3	2	3	2.75
Mean	2.68	2.50	2.45	2.73	2.60

Note. 1 = rarely used; 2 = used to a certain extent; 3 = most frequently used.

As indicated in Table 5, mean frequencies across all leaders were highest for the research-based responsibilities *communication, discipline, ideals/beliefs, and knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment*, indicating that the leaders perceived themselves as engaging in these responsibilities with the highest frequency (“most frequently used”). Mean frequencies across all leaders were lowest for the responsibilities *change agent, involvement in*

curriculum, instruction, and assessment, and *optimizer*, indicating that the leaders perceived themselves as fulfilling these research-based responsibilities only to a certain extent, rather than frequently. Leader 3 assessed himself as fulfilling the responsibility *change agent* rarely; this was the only instance in which a participating leader perceived him- or herself as rarely fulfilling a leadership responsibility. Of the 84 responses (i.e., 21 responses from each of four leaders), the mode response was 3 ($n = 51$), or *most frequently used*. The highest mean for one participant across all responses was obtained by Leader 4, while the lowest mean across all responses was obtained by Leader 3. All leaders' mean responses indicated an overall fulfillment of leadership responsibilities at a frequency between *used to a certain extent* and *used most frequently*. Of the seven research-based responsibilities found to initiate second order change (Marzano et al., 2005), *change agent* and *optimizer* had the lowest mean frequencies of 2. *Intellectual stimulation* had a mean frequency of 2.5. *Flexibility* and *monitoring/evaluating* had mean scores of 2.75. The responsibilities *ideals/beliefs* and *knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment* had frequency mean scores of 3. The research strategies *change agent*, *adaptability*, and *optimizer*, which directly align to the Goleman competencies *change catalyst*, *flexibility*, and *optimism* respectively, had mean frequencies between 2 and 2.75.

Data Analysis Procedures

Survey data were collected from four school leaders and analyzed using descriptive statistics. Interview data were collected from four school leaders (in one-on-one semi-structured face-to-face interviews) and from 19 subordinates of those leaders (in four focus groups). All interviews were audio-recorded using a digital recording device and transcribed verbatim. Transcriptions were analyzed using the six-step method described by Creswell (2014). After organizing and preparing the data by transcribing it, the researcher read through the

transcriptions making notes in the margins and highlighting information to gain familiarity with the data and to identify points of potential analytical interest. In the third step, the researcher began the process of coding the data into brackets or chunks. This step involved categorizing words or phrases in a meaningful way into groups, which were then labeled with descriptive words or phrases, such as *encouraging buy-in* and *emotion and work interactions*. Data elements were categorized under the same code when they had similar meanings and were relevant to the research questions. In the fourth step, the researcher generated descriptions of the themes that emerged when similar codes were grouped together. Overall, 25 codes were grouped into seven themes. The fifth step involved determining how the themes would be represented in a qualitative narrative, and the sixth and last step involved interpreting the data. The results of steps four and five of the analysis are presented in the Data Analysis Results section below, and the results of the sixth step of the analysis are presented in chapter 5. Table 6 indicates the themes that emerged during the fourth step of the analysis of data obtained from the leaders in response to research questions 1 and 2.

Table 6

Research Questions 1 and 2 Data Analysis Themes and Codes

Theme	Codes contributing to theme	Number of data elements included in code	Percentage of data elements included in code ($n=143$)
(1) Building positive relationships	Connection between EI and effectiveness	9	6.29%
	Emotion and work interactions	5	3.50%
	Experience and empathy	4	2.80%
	Visibility and relationships	2	1.40%
(continued)			

Theme	Codes contributing to theme	Number of data elements included in code	Percentage of data elements included in code ($n=143$)
(2) Setting the emotional tone	Improving performance	4	2.80%
	Maintaining composure	6	4.20%
	Optimism and leadership	4	2.80%
(3) Relationship management	Promoting teamwork and collaboration	5	3.50%
	Managing staff conflict	2	1.40%
	Leading by example	1	0.70%
	Using data	2	1.40%
(4) Social awareness	Encouraging buy-in	7	4.90%
	Building culture	1	0.70%
(5) Self-awareness and self-management	Strengths	9	6.29%
	Weaknesses	6	4.20%
	Transparency	4	2.80%

Table 7 indicates the themes that emerged from the focus group interviews in response to research question 3 during the fourth step of the analysis of data obtained from the leaders and the phase-three codes that contributed to the themes.

Table 7

Research Question 3 Data Analysis Themes and Codes

Theme	Codes contributing to theme	Number of data elements included in code	Percentage of data elements included in code ($n=143$)
(6) Managing conflict and resistance	Receptive to challenges/questions	8	5.59%
	Managing staff conflict	12	8.39%
	Listening to all sides	7	4.90%
	Transparent about expectations	3	2.10%
(7) Adapting to change	Attunement and adaptation	14	9.79%
	Trust/allowance of failure	3	2.10%
	Enabling peer reliance	4	2.80%
	Building others	9	6.29%
	Clear justifications	12	8.39%

Data Analysis Results

This presentation of results is organized by research question. Results associated with Research Question 1 indicated how school leaders viewed the role of emotions in the execution of their duties. In relation to Research Question 2, results indicated which characteristics of EI school leaders reported when they described their leadership practices. Results associated with Research Question 3 indicated how teachers reported that school leaders used EI when faced with challenges. Within the presentation of results associated with each research question, results are organized by theme. Within the presentation related to each theme, results are organized by school leader.

Research Question 1

Results associated with Research Question 1 were derived from one-on-one semi-structured face-to-face interviews with school leaders. Two major themes emerged during data analysis to indicate how school leaders viewed the role of emotions in the execution of their duties, including: (1) *building positive relationships* and (2) *setting the emotional tone*. Four out of four leaders contributed to each theme.

Major Theme 1: Building positive relationships. Four out of four school leaders indicated in their one-on-one semi-structured face-to-face interviews that they used emotions in the execution of their duties to build positive relationships with their subordinates. Leaders indicated that they built positive relationships with their subordinates through the Goleman EI domains of social awareness, self-awareness, and self-management. Table 8 indicates the Goleman EI competencies school leaders used to build positive relationships in the execution of their duties and the school leader participants who used each competency.

Table 8

Goleman EI Competencies Used in Building Positive Relationships

EI competency	Leader 1	Leader 2	Leader 3	Leader 4
Empathy	X	X		X
Emotional self-control		X	X	X
Emotional self-awareness			X	
Accurate self-assessment	X	X		

In affirming that a strong relationship existed between EI and a leader's level of effectiveness, Leader 1 expressed the perceived importance of empathizing with subordinates as

a means of building positive relationships, adding, “At the end of the day, [what] most people wanted to know is that they're cared about.” Leader 1 also stated that she perceived positive relationships with staff as the most important condition of effective school leadership, stating: “The most effective leaders are those that have an emotional connection to their faculty and staff.”

Leader 2 indicated that a school leader’s effectiveness was determined by his or her ability to build positive relationships with staff, saying, “You create this vision, you've led your team into meeting goals...and none of that happens unless you're able to build effective relationships with the staff.” Like Leader 1, Leader 2 reported that building positive relationships depended on the leader’s empathy, which allowed the leader to arrive at an accurate self-assessment by understanding how his subordinates perceived him. Leader 2 stated that the kind of empathy that led to positive relationships involved “always knowing the pulse of your staff and... knowing how your teachers feel about you, about your policies, about your effectiveness.” For Leader 2, an important part of the empathy that led to positive relationships was managing himself in such a way that he never ignored the opinions his staff expressed to him: “I kind of made it my mission to whatever the circumstances were I was never going to discount or marginalize the teacher's feelings.” Empathy and building positive relationships also involved engaging with all levels of staff, according to Leader 2: “I treat everyone with respect...bus drivers, cafeteria staff, custodians, teachers, students, I have the same level of conversation with anyone and it kind of amazes people.” Leader 2 further noted that emotional self-control contributed to his ability to build relationships, saying that self-control was important because, “my emotional state lends itself to others wanting to build relationships with me.”

For Leader 3, self-awareness and self-management were vital to building positive relationships, because his self-awareness and self-care allowed him to make himself available for relationship-building interactions with staff. When he accomplished his goals and managed himself, Leader 3 reached out to his staff more often: “If I accomplish my goals... if I get some good sleep or eat right, then I'm more apt to interact with people in the workplace.” Conversely, if Leader 3 failed to take adequate care of himself or to perform his duties to his own standards, he found that he tended to isolate himself: “If I feel overwhelmed, I used to become distracted and I'm not interacting with people as much... I spend more time in my office.”

For Leader 4, empathy led to positive relationships by keeping the leader attuned to the needs and feelings of her staff so that she could lead more effectively: “I get the vibe, ‘Is something wrong this morning? How can I support you? I love the way you did that, can you teach me?’ And I might know how to do it.” Leader 4 associated empathy with emotional self-control, because she reported that a leader needed to keep herself relaxed to remain alert and receptive to emotional cues from her staff: “[When] you're relaxed enough, you have the capacity to pick up on the needs of the people that you partner with, that is so powerful.” Leader 4 also reported that school leaders needed to empathize with students: “I can put a tent in front of each student and tell you what's going on: ‘I know he's going to court tomorrow, that's why he somber’... If you had that gift [of empathizing]... you can make a difference.” According to Leader 4, a further condition of empathy that would lead to positive relationships with students and staff was self-management: “It's shutting down ego, it's going and allowing them to pour into you, and you pour into them.”

Major Theme 2: Setting the emotional tone. Four out of four school leaders indicated in their one-on-one semi-structured face-to-face interviews that they used emotions in the

execution of their duties to set the emotional tone of the work environment for staff. Leaders indicated that they set the emotional tone for their subordinates through the Goleman EI domains of social awareness, self-awareness, and self-management. Table 9 indicates the Goleman EI competencies that school leaders described themselves as using to set the emotional tone for the workplace in the execution of their duties, the number of school leader participants who used each competency and the school leader participants who used each competency.

Table 9

Goleman EI Competencies Used in Setting the Emotional Tone for the Workplace

Goleman EI competency	Leader 1	Leader 2	Leader 3	Leader 4
Emotional self-control	X	X	X	X
Emotional self-awareness	X	X		X
Accurate self-assessment	X	X		X
Optimism				X
Achievement			X	
Empathy		X		

Leader 1 stated that the emotional tone of the school environment was associated with the leader's mood: "I think that the building can take on the tone of the leader." Therefore, Leader 1 used self-awareness and self-management to ensure that she set a positive tone for students and staff. In using emotional self-awareness and emotional self-control, she compelled herself not only to acknowledge but to verbalize her negative emotions as a means of neutralizing their effects on her subordinates: "It's something that I have to be cognizant of. Like when I'm having a bad day, I have to say it... and be okay with it." Self-awareness and self-management allowed

her to acknowledge and act on the condition that lapses in self-care routines affected her mood and, by extension, the emotional tone of her school: “I have to know that if I don't eat sometimes, I will be irritable... I have to take care of myself.”

Leader 2 indicated that he used social awareness, self-awareness, and self-management to set the tone for his school. He described the outcome of his self-assessment and emotional self-control as an equable demeanor “People know that I'm stable and when they see that you are, you never get too high, you never get too low.” Emotional self-awareness and emotional self-control allowed him to present his workday demeanor as example of service and diligence:

I'm from that school of like servant leadership where I'm not just visible and building relationships, but I'm gonna do whatever it takes to make you successful. So I would sharpen boxes of pencils, go make copies, you know, whatever. (Leader 2, interview response)

Leader 2 used empathy to create a culture in which staff felt valued as a means of sustaining a high level of morale, having learned the value of this practice from his experience of leaders who did not allow subordinates to be heard: “It wears teachers down, seeing how tuning teachers out can cause them to, you know, morale to go down.”

Leader 3 used self-management/achievement to promote excellence in his school: “My drive to improve, it guides the work in the sense; I try to work on things that we're not strong in and try to get that done.” Leader 3 had also used self-management/optimism to set the tone for his school while he led his staff into a new policy for grading and testing despite pushback from some teachers: “I was optimistic that the community will love it and the students will love it... it was a big deal [but] we got through it.”

Leader 4 employed self-awareness and self-management in setting the tone for her building. She described ways in which school leaders could use or fail to use competencies associated with these EI domains to promote a variety of outcomes for a school:

If you are messy, most likely your workplace is going to be messy. If you can't be trusted, most likely you gonna build a culture of distrust. The way I come in this building, preludes how the day is going to go. The things I say about central office will be a prelude to the way my staff is going to view central office. The way I treat the students will give [teachers] permission to treat them a certain way. (Leader 4, interview response)

Research Question 2

Results associated with Research Question 2 were derived from one-on-one semi-structured face-to-face interviews with school leaders. Three major themes emerged during data analysis to indicate which characteristics of EI school leaders reported using when they described their leadership practices, including (3) *relationship management*, (4) *social awareness*, and (5) *self-awareness and self-management*. Self-awareness and self-management are combined into one major theme because leaders tended to blend these two domains in their responses. Four out of four leaders contributed to the findings.

Major Theme 3: Relationship management. Four out of four leaders reported that they used relationship management in their leadership practices. Goleman competencies that school leaders reported using when they managed relationships included teamwork and collaboration, change catalyst, conflict management, influence, and inspirational leadership. Table 10 indicates the Goleman EI competencies that school leaders used in their leadership practices to manage relationships and the school leader participants who used each competency.

Table 10

Goleman EI Competencies Used in Managing Relationships

Goleman EI competency	Leader 1	Leader 2	Leader 3	Leader 4
Teamwork and collaboration	X		X	X
Influence		X	X	
Conflict management	X			
Change catalyst	X			
Inspirational leadership		X		

Leader 1 used the relationship management competencies change catalyst, teamwork and collaboration, and conflict management in her leadership practices. As a change catalyst, she took a mentoring role: “As a leader, you have to go in and educate people on the need for change.” She added that in acting as a change catalyst she would guide stakeholder groups step-by-step through change processes. As an example of her implementation of teamwork and collaboration, Leader 1 cited her expansion of her school’s leadership team and her granting of more responsibilities to her department heads, adding that her intention in making these changes was to “bring people together.” However, she recognized that bringing people together sometimes created occasions for conflict, so she was ready to engage in conflict management by helping disputants to appreciate each other’s point of view: “Sometimes, they’re not talking and there’s a lack of understanding on both sides, so I’m able to bring them in and kind of play referee a little bit and encourage the questions.”

Leader 2 reported using influence and inspirational leadership to manage relationships in his leadership practices. As an example of his use of influence, Leader 2 cited his method of

reasoning with teachers who were unwilling to make changes because they perceived the status quo as satisfactory. He began by conceding that the current state of affairs was going well, but then cited evidence of the potential for improvement by saying, in effect, “Here's where it could be, and here's the evidence or the data to support how we can grow this thing or this culture.”

Leader 2 implemented inspirational leadership when he led by example: “I never ever ask someone to do something that I'm not willing to do myself. So, whether it be cafeteria duty, hall duty whatever the case is, I am always first and foremost on the front lines.”

Leader 3 used teamwork and collaboration and influence. In promoting teamwork and collaboration, Leader 3 practiced shared leadership with his staff and ensured that everyone's point of view was taken into account: “I think [shared leadership] allows [staff] to know they have a stake in what we're talking about... that we're hearing their suggestions in whatever we implement and so we definitely take that to heart.” In using influence, Leader 3 employed different tactics, depending on the situation and the subordinate's level of resistance to the proposed change, using emotional persuasion, and also evidence and reasoning: “If it's something I feel strongly about, I will tell `em how I feel... But, I also base everything on...data and research.”

Leader 4 used teamwork and collaboration in her leadership practices to manage relationships. In using this competency, Leader 4 would hold open discussions with staff about proposed changes. Along with the affected staff, she would weigh the pros and cons of a proposal: “We'll examine [a proposed change] together, we'll talk about it together, and the end result is how do you make the load lighter more so than the change?”

Major Theme 4: Social awareness. Four out of four leaders reported that they used social awareness in their leadership practices. Goleman competencies that school leaders used when

they practiced social awareness included organizational awareness, empathy, and service. Table 11 indicates the Goleman EI competencies that school leaders used when practicing social awareness and the school leader participants who used each competency.

Table 11

Goleman EI Competencies Used in Practicing Social Awareness

Goleman EI competency	Leader 1	Leader 2	Leader 3	Leader 4
Empathy		X	X	X
Organizational awareness	X		X	
Service				X

Leader 1 used organizational awareness when practicing social awareness. For Leader 1, organizational awareness took the form of recognizing the different roles that different stakeholders held with respect to the school and guiding those stakeholders accordingly. Leader 1 stated, “Everyone’s role looks different... But, you inform each stakeholder group as to how the importance of their role feeds into the overall development.”

Leader 2 used empathy when practicing social awareness. In citing an example of his use of empathy in his leadership practices, he described his meeting with an indignant parent whose son had broken his arm while running in a school hall. He indicated his clear awareness of the woman’s feelings: “I was aware of what she was feeling and the anxiety and the anger over her son’s arm in a cast and she needing to blame someone.” He used his awareness of the parent’s feelings to help her feel acknowledged and heard, and then he was able to express his own viewpoint persuasively.

Leader 3 used organizational awareness and empathy when he practiced social awareness. Leader 3's use of organizational awareness involved a balancing of the interests of the different stakeholders who expressed their needs to him: "There's something that...the teachers or the parents and the community want to change, [I'm] always willing to hear that out and make the suggestion to the district given if we can have some flexibility." Leader 3 used empathy to understand teachers' perspectives when he needed to persuade them to make a change. His appreciation for his staff members' points of view allowed him to acknowledge their perspectives while presenting his own: "I just lay it out on the line: 'This is a district initiative. I don't have to like it, you know, I'm going to support it,' so then the teacher now sees, 'Hey, he's not trying to sugarcoat it.'"

Leader 4 used empathy and service when practicing social awareness. Empathy made her acutely aware of the impact of changes on her staff: "The last thing I want to do as a leader is to overwhelm my staff... There are some changes that I don't even bring back because it...makes them weary." Service made her a strong advocate for her staff. She conveyed to her subordinates the message, "I will fight for you... Whatever you need to move forward." In speaking of her advocacy on behalf of her staff, she stated, "You let them know that you see them, you care for them, you're here to support them... And, I think that brings about more change than anything."

Major Theme 5: Self-awareness and self-management. Self-awareness and self-management are combined into one major theme because leaders tended to blend these two domains in their responses. Four out of four school leaders reported that they used self-awareness and self-management in their leadership practices. Table 12 indicates the Goleman EI competencies that school leaders used when practicing self-awareness and self-management, along with the school leader participants who used each competency.

Table 12

Goleman EI Competencies Used in Practicing Self-Awareness and Self-Management

Goleman EI competency	Leader 1	Leader 2	Leader 3	Leader 4
Accurate self-assessment	X	X	X	X
Transparency	X	X	X	X
Self-confidence	X	X		
Achievement	X			
Adaptability			X	

Leader 1 used the self-awareness competency of accurate self-assessment and the self-management competencies of optimism, achievement, and transparency in her leadership practices. Her accurate self-assessment was demonstrated in her perception of her transparency as potentially excessive: “I’m extremely transparent, maybe almost too transparent.” She tended to err on the side of transparency due to the necessity of candor in effective leadership: “We need to create a plan and put people in place to move that plan. Well, you can’t do that unless you have a high level of transparency.” Her self-confidence and achievement were demonstrated in her description of her strengths as a leader: “My strength is building a culture of high expectations, and holding people accountable... I think one of my strengths is [being] a change agent.”

Like Leader 1, Leader 2 expressed his accurate self-assessment when describing his transparency: “I’ve always gone above and beyond in terms of being transparent...I just believe in being overly transparent, sometimes, to a fault.” He displayed his self-confidence in describing his adaptability in working with any personality type: “Other leaders consider groups challenging

and not wanting to work with specific personality types. I think one of my strengths is that I can work with anyone.”

Leader 3 demonstrated an accurate self-assessment in acknowledging the tendency to procrastinate that manifested itself in his leadership practices: “I tend to procrastinate... sometimes, I wonder if I'm getting it right and that sometimes takes an extra day or two.” He indicated that he indulged his acknowledged tendency to procrastinate because it served a purpose in his leadership practices: “I want to make sure I get [my decisions] right.” Leader 3 also practiced transparency in his communications with subordinates, and reported that he adhered to, “being transparent and telling them exactly what's happening.”

Leader 4 incorporated her transparency into her accurate self-assessment; unlike Leaders 1 and 2, she perceived her transparency as unequivocally positive: “I'm very open, I voice my opinion, I say what I have to say, and I do it in a way that if you...use my name as a handle, it was ethical, it was professional.” Leader 4 also displayed her accurate self-assessment in admitting a weakness, however, when she indicated that she tended to undertake tasks herself when delegation would be more appropriate: “I'm introverted and protective of the students and the teachers that I partner with. Therefore, I am more apt to [meet] a need [myself] than to reach out [for help].”

Research Question 3

Results associated with Research Question 3 were derived from four focus groups, one of which was held with subordinates of each of the four leaders who provided interview and survey data. Two major themes emerged during data analysis to indicate how teachers reported that school leaders used EI when faced with challenges, including (6) *managing conflict and*

resistance and (7) *adapting to change*. Table 13 indicates the major themes that emerged and along with the focus groups that contributed to each theme.

Table 13

Research Question 3 Themes

Major theme	Leader 1 Focus Group	Leader 2 Focus Group	Leader 3 Focus Group	Leader 4 Focus Group
(6) Managing conflict and resistance	X	X	X	X
(7) Adapting to change	X	X	X	X

Major Theme 6: Managing conflict and resistance. Participants in four out of four focus groups indicated that school leaders used characteristics of EI to manage conflicts between staff members and to manage resistance (i.e., conflict between the leader and staff members). EI domains used by school leaders to manage conflict and resistance were relationship management and self-management. Table 14 indicates the Goleman EI competencies that subordinates reported their leaders used when managing conflict and resistance, along with the focus groups that reported each competency.

Table 14

Goleman EI Competencies Used in Managing Conflict and Resistance

Goleman EI competency	Leader 1 Focus Group	Leader 2 Focus Group	Leader 3 Focus Group	Leader 4 Focus Group
Conflict management	X	X	X	X
Adaptability	X		X	X
Influence			X	X
Teamwork and collaboration			X	X
Inspirational leadership				X
Transparency	X			

The Leader 1 Focus Group indicated that Leader 1 used the self-management competencies of adaptability and transparency, and the relationship management competency of conflict management, to manage conflict and resistance. Of Leader 1's adaptability, a focus group participant said, "I think that she's willing to hear that push back, but what's good is if you can convince her, then she changes." Of Leader 1's transparency, a subordinate indicated that Leader 1 was willing to be transparent about a resistant teacher's compatibility with school objectives: "She's open in saying this is what is needed in the school [and] if you don't comply, that means this may not be a great place for you." Leader 1's conflict management style involved making sure that both sides were heard: "She feels that both sides are important before she makes any type of decision."

The Leader 2 Focus Group indicated that Leader 2 used conflict management as part of his leadership practices. Leader 2's conflict management style was based on listening to staff members' concerns: "He was able to solve a lot of issues because he listened." Leader 2's

reputation as a good listener was based on the culture of openness he had created in the school: “If you ran into any type of obstacle, he always made you feel comfortable to where you could go back and speak with him about it.”

The Leader 3 Focus Group indicated that Leader 3 used the relationship management competencies teamwork and collaboration, influence, and conflict management, and the self-management competency adaptability, to manage conflict and resistance. In giving an example of Leader 3’s teamwork and collaboration, a focus group member stated that Leader 3 had met with community members who were resisting a protocol change in the school, listened to their arguments, and persuaded them to support the change, adding, “He was a team player.” In using the conflict management competency, Leader 3 gave subordinates the freedom to respectfully differ from one another, creating a culture that was characterized by, “People feeling comfortable enough to agree to disagree.” Leader 3 created this culture in which conflict was kept at manageable levels by “treating everyone as professionals and adults.” Leader 3 could also use influence successfully: “He knows when to put his foot down.” Leader 3’s subordinates saw his adaptability in the way he tried different approaches when faced with conflict or resistance, with one focus group member reporting, “I know he’s went back and regrouped and said, ‘Okay, well, how can I address this in a different way.’”

The Leader 4 Focus Group indicated that Leader 4 used the relationship management competencies teamwork and collaboration, influence, inspirational leadership, and conflict management, and the self-management competency adaptability, to manage conflicts and resistance. Leader 4 used inspirational leadership in conjunction with teamwork and collaboration to reduce the potential for disagreements to arise among staff by “establishing clear goals, and keep[ing] those goals in the forefront of the school.” This inspirational leadership

created a culture of teamwork and collaboration of which a focus group member could say, “We’re all focused on the clear goals, and the same determination, there’s no time for conflict because the goals and the focus are the same.” In using conflict manager, Leader 4 would listen to both sides and get each side to listen to the other: “If it’s something that she feels she needs to bring folks to the table she’ll bring both persons, and you get an opportunity to talk.” Leader 4’s use of influence and adaptability were related, as she adapted in order to use a range of tactics for persuasion: “she definitely tries a different approach if the first time doesn’t work...and see if she can come up with another way to get what she needs.” A focus group member said of Leader 4’s adaptability, “She looks for the win-win.”

Major Theme 7: Adapting to change. Participants in four out of four focus groups indicated that school leaders used EI to adapt themselves to change, and to help staff members adapt to change by encouraging buy-in. EI domains used by school leaders to adapt to change were relationship management, social awareness, and self-management. Table 15 indicates the Goleman EI competencies that subordinates reported their leaders used when adapting to change, along with the focus groups that reported each competency.

Table 15

Goleman EI Competencies Used in Adapting to Change

Goleman EI competency	Leader 1 Focus Group	Leader 2 Focus Group	Leader 3 Focus Group	Leader 4 Focus Group
Emotional self-control	X	X	X	X
Transparency	X	X	X	
Initiative	X		X	X
Teamwork and collaboration		X	X	X
Developing others		X	X	X
Inspirational leadership	X			X
Empathy		X		X
Adaptability			X	
Achievement	X			
Organizational awareness			X	
Influence	X			

The Leader 1 Focus Group indicated that in adapting to change Leader 1 used the relationship management competencies inspirational leadership and influence, and the self-management competencies transparency, achievement, emotional self-control, and initiative. Of Leader 1's inspirational leadership during changes, a focus group member stated, "She has a vision... she wants a classic education for every one of her students." Leader 1's vision had led her to take the initiative on many occasions, including an instance in which she brought a new sport to the school: "Everyone in the district thought she was crazy when she wanted to have

Lacrosse...[but] she knew that other children or other students had access to that and our kids deserved the same thing.” Leader 1’s staff had seen her emotional self-control during changes grow over time: “What used to excite her doesn't really excite her anymore,” said one focus group member. Of her achievement competency, which had motivated Leader 1 to make changes in the school, a focus group member stated, “She wants to be the best, and she does not settle for anything less, so she is constantly striving for this greatness.” Leader 1 was also transparent about expectations during changes: “She set I think boundaries and things that she wanted to see.” In addition, Leader 1 would use influence during changes by trying different tactics to persuade her subordinates to buy in: “She might bring people from outside to do the convincing or she might bring data from outside to say if this is wrong.”

The Leader 2 Focus Group indicated that in adapting to change Leader 2 used the relationship management competencies developing others and teamwork and collaboration; the social awareness competency of empathy, and the self-management competencies transparency and emotional self-control. Leader 2’s transparency and emotional self-control were related, according to a focus group participant who stated, “Even if he felt that something was not done correctly he would again guide and show how to do and so that you can make corrections for the next opportunity... he always expressed through self-control.” Leader 2 fostered change by developing others; he practiced this competency by allowing his subordinates to take risks and by not punishing mistakes too harshly: “You allow them to make the errors and the mistakes which positive achievement as well then they grow as you learn from your mistakes, and you’ll allow them to take risk, as well.” In promoting teamwork and collaboration to make changes smoother, Leader 2 created teams of interdependent teachers who could count on one another: “He had different teams like he would have team A, she would hold my classroom when I don't

have a sub and team B would probably say, 'I will hold that room.'" Empathy allowed Leader 2 to remain aware of his staff's individual goals and needs while he led the school through transitions: "He took a genuine interest in what you were doing and what you wanted to do."

The Leader 3 Focus Group indicated that in adapting to change Leader 3 used the relationship management competencies developing others and teamwork and collaboration; the social awareness competency of organizational awareness, and; the self-management competencies transparency, adaptability, initiative, and emotional self-control. For Leader 3, organizational awareness and emotional self-control were related, according to a focus group participant who stated that Leader 3 maintained a clear sense of organizational needs and capabilities when calmly reviewing proposals for change: "That also goes back to the emotional self-control. Not being impulsive. But being able to sit back and take the time to look at and decide whether or not it's a good fit for our culture here." Leader 3 used initiative in foreseeing problems that might arise during changes and addressing them preemptively: "I think he's very preventative. He tries to get ahead of things or tries to put policies and procedures in place to avoid things." In describing Leader 3 as a principal who developed others, one focus group participant recounted an occasion when he had shown a refreshing willingness to rely on a subordinate's proven competence: "'I've reviewed your credentials,' he says, 'I'm gonna trust you to be professional, I trust my teachers to do their job. I'm not going to micromanage you, do what you're hired to do, and the rest will just take care of itself.'" Focus group participants agreed that Leader 3 was transparent during changes, with one member describing Leader 3's openness in these terms: "There's no hiding. There's no behind closed doors, smoke and mirrors. [Leader 3 says,] 'This is what the problem is. This is what the challenge is.'" Leader 3 was also adaptable in trying different solutions to problems that arose during changes; one focus group

member described Leader 3's adaptable thinking as proceeding in this manner: "Okay, this didn't work. So, let's go with a different plan." Of Leader 3's promotion of teamwork and collaboration, a focus group member stated, "He's very big on allowing a team to generate ideas, not just coming directly from him."

The Leader 4 Focus Group indicated that in adapting to change Leader 4 used the relationship management competencies developing others, inspirational leadership, and teamwork and collaboration; the social awareness competency of empathy, and; the self-management competencies initiative and emotional self-control. In using teamwork and collaboration during changes, Leader 4 would bring people together and seek their input: "So, she may pull the leadership team together, but she also pulls everybody together and give everybody an opportunity to give their input." Leader 4 demonstrated initiative by carefully monitoring the entire school: "She try [sic] to stay in touch with the students, each staff, she visits every classroom, speak to every student, either as they're entering the building, or if she's just walking to the classroom." To develop others, Leader 4 used empathy: "She knows my strengths and weakness 'cause she has learned me and you know, pushed me all of this and she kinda stretched me a little bit to grow." Leader 4 was known among her subordinates as an unusually empathetic leader: "She deals with the whole person. She doesn't just deal with you academically, professionally, she finds out what's going on with you emotionally all the way around." In providing inspirational leadership, Leader 4 approached her subordinates with a clear vision: "She tutors for us to be the change that we wanna see in the world...Merchants of hope, that's what she calls us." Of Leader 4's emotional self-control, one focus group member stated, "She doesn't break a sweat. She doesn't stress."

Interviews were conducted using a conversational style and study participants appeared to be relaxed in answering questions. Responses from the school leaders and focus groups appeared to be truthful. They were thoughtful in responding to the researcher's questions.

Chapter Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the practices of school leaders and the role of EI in their work. To accomplish this purpose, individual interview data and survey data were collected from four school leaders, and 19 subordinates of those leaders were grouped into four focus groups (one per leader) and interviewed. Three research questions were used to guide the study. The first research question was: How do school leaders view the role of emotions in the execution of their duties? School leader participants indicated that they viewed emotions as essential to the execution of their duties, particularly in building positive relationships with subordinates and setting the emotional tone of the school. The second research question was: What characteristics of EI do school leaders report when they describe their leadership practices? School leader participants indicated that they used the Goleman EI domains *social awareness*, *relationship management*, *self-awareness*, and *self-management* in their leadership practices. The third research question was: How do teachers report that school leaders use EI when faced with challenges? Subordinates who participated in the focus groups indicated that school leaders used EI to manage conflict and resistance and to adapt themselves and help their subordinates adapt to change. Chapter 5 includes interpretation and implications of these results.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Leadership and school performance have been topics of debate since the 1980s and the promotion of restructuring public education in the United States in order to close the achievement gap amongst students at both national and international levels. Since then, the challenging context of leading schools has only become more complex due to societal changes and mounting mandates, including increased challenges in shrinking budgets, state funding issues, changing student and neighborhood demographics, integrating technology into the classroom, implementing character education and school-wide bullying interventions, and adopting Common Core Standards initiatives (Bedessem-Chandler, 2014). The purpose of this study was thus to examine the practices of school leaders and the role of EI in their work to inform the practices of school leaders.

The theoretical frameworks for this study included Goleman's (1998) theory of EI and Marzano et al. (2005) work on research-based leadership practices that impact student achievement. Goleman's work focused on the impact of emotional competencies on an individual's professional performance. Marzano et al. (2005) sought to identify educational leadership practices that significantly impacted student achievement and thereby contributed to successful leadership. To accomplish the purpose of the study, data were collected through individual interview data and survey data from four school leaders, and 19 subordinates of those leaders. The 19 subordinates were grouped into four focus groups (one per leader) and interviewed. The initial aim was to interview five school leaders, yet only four school leaders took part in the study. This research was guided by three research questions. The first research question inquired how school leaders view the role of emotions in the execution of their duties.

The findings of RQ1 yielded two major themes: (1) *building positive relationships* and (2) *setting the emotional tone*. The second research question asked what characteristics of EI school leaders report when they describe their leadership practices. The findings of RQ2 yielded three major themes: (3) *relationship management*, (4) *social awareness*, and (5) *self-awareness and self-management*. The third and final research question inquired how teachers report that school leaders use EI when faced with challenges. The findings of RQ3 also yielded two major themes: (6) *managing conflict and resistance* and (7) *adapting to change*. The analysis of the data thus provided seven major themes in total. The following section will discuss the findings in light of the literature. Findings are presented first thematically aligned to the research questions. After the discussion of themes, is a summary of each of the four leaders. Leader summaries first address research questions one and two followed by a discussion of research question three. The rest of this chapter will provide implications for the findings, a discussion of the limitations, recommendations for future research, and will end with a conclusion.

Interpretation of the Findings

This section will provide a discussion of the findings and how it relates to the literature according to each research question and theme. The findings of the first two research questions were derived from a demographic questionnaire, a card sorting activity, and semi-structured face-to-face interviews with four school leaders. The findings of research question three were derived from four focus groups that were made up of 19 subordinates, four to five subordinates working with each of the leaders. All data points were analyzed in order to develop a well rounded picture of how each leader and the corresponding focus group viewed the role of EI in the work of the leaders. Overall, each of the themes was corroborated by all of the leaders as well as all of the focus groups independently.

Research Question 1

How do school leaders view the role of emotions in the execution of their duties? All of the school leaders indicated that they perceived emotions to be essential to the execution of their duties, particularly in building positive relationships with subordinates and setting the emotional tone of the school. According to the literature, the link between emotion and school climate has not been empirically evidenced. While it is known that school culture and climate directly impact student achievement, it has been less accepted that school leaders have a direct effect on student achievement (Ashworth, 2013; Berry, 2013; Grunes et al., 2014; Hanlin, 2014; Harney, 2015; Juma, 2013). The link between the two has often been understood as indirect, given that the school administrator has the greatest effect over school culture and climate (Akomolafe & Olatomide, 2013; Brinia et al., 2014; Mak, 2014; Maulding et al., 2012; Moore, 2009; Waters et al., 2003). Two major themes emerged during data analysis to indicate how school leaders viewed the role of emotions in the execution of their duties, including: (1) *building positive relationships* and (2) *setting the emotional tone*.

Major Theme 1: Building positive relationships. Four out of four school leaders indicated that they used emotions in the execution of their duties to build positive relationships with their subordinates. Leaders indicated that they built positive relationships with their subordinates through the Goleman EI domains of social awareness, self-awareness, and self-management. Taliadorou and Pashiardis (2015) found that principals with strong emotional competences affect teacher job satisfaction, because they commit time to cultivating positive social relationships at work, demonstrate genuine concern for others, understand others, and build relationships within the workplace.

One participant expressed the perceived importance of empathizing with subordinates as a means of building positive relationships, and added that she perceived positive relationships with staff as the most important condition of effective school leadership. Leader 4 was in agreement with this, and stated that empathy led to positive relationships by keeping the leader attuned to the needs and feelings of her staff so that she could lead more effectively. Craig (2008) defined emotionally intelligent principals as leaders attuned to others' and their own emotions. Another participant added that emotional self-control contributed to his ability to build relationships. Alternatively, a principal with too much emotional self-control may not demonstrate the necessary amount of emotion to develop a bond with teachers emotionally to incite organizational citizenship behavior OCB (Sun & Leithwood, 2015). The findings of this research was thus mostly in agreement with the literature, except in the case of too much self-control. Further research may be needed to clarify the benchmark for too much emotional self-control, and a healthy level of emotional self-control in order to facilitate OCB and develop bonds with teachers.

Major Theme 2: Setting the emotional tone. Four out of four school leaders indicated that they used emotions in the execution of their duties to set the emotional tone of the work environment for staff. Leader 1 stated that the emotional tone of the school environment was associated with the leader's mood, while another participant indicated that he used social awareness, self-awareness, and self-management to set the tone for his school. Principals are held accountable for the school climate, culture, and environment (Harney, 2015; Moore, 2009; Segredo, 2014), as well as the teachers' perceptions which may be significantly impacted by principal-teacher relationships and therefore a principal's EI (Barnes, 2015; Brinia et al., 2014; Hanlin, 2014).

One participant used empathy to create a culture in which staff felt valued as a means of sustaining a high level of morale, having learned the value of this practice from his experience of leaders who did not allow subordinates to be heard. This statement was also related to the first theme of building relationships. Job satisfaction, collective teacher efficacy, and organizational citizenship behavior highlight the importance of leadership's emotional competence for addressing and accommodating teachers' emotions and feelings, especially given their direct impact on student learning (Bedessem-Chandler, 2014; Berkovich & Eyal, 2017; Cliffe, 2011; Craig, 2008; Grobler, 2014; Pierce, 2014; Sun & Leithwood, 2015; Taliadorou & Pashiardis, 2015). Leader 3 had also used self-management/optimism to set the tone for his school while he led his staff into a new policy for grading and testing despite pushback from some teachers. These findings, since all the leaders were in agreement and the findings were in agreement with the literature, indicate that emotion has a significant effect on subordinates in a school environment and should be considered as a highly influential factor.

Research Question 2

What characteristics of emotional intelligence do school leaders report when they describe their leadership practices? Three major themes emerged during data analysis to indicate which characteristics of EI school leaders reported using when they described their leadership practices, including (3) *relationship management*, (4) *social awareness*, and (5) *self-awareness and self-management*. Moore (2009) identified emotions as a source of information that can be used by leaders to build trust, cooperation, and empathetic relationships with employees to demonstrate social awareness and skill in addressing issues and solving problems. Thus far the findings has been in agreement with this statement.

Major Theme 3: Relationship management. Four out of four leaders reported that they used relationship management in their leadership practices. One participant used the relationship management competencies change catalyst, teamwork and collaboration, and conflict management in her leadership practices. Mak (2014) and Berry (2015) found that teachers' participation in decision-making in disciplinary policy and establishing curriculum, and autonomy and trust in teachers influenced teachers' job satisfaction. Another participant reported using influence and inspirational leadership to manage relationships in his leadership practices. In agreement, research has indicated that there was a strong association between school culture and transformational and transactional leadership measures (Segredo, 2014). EI was a strong factor in effective leadership (Brinia et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2016). Furthermore, in promoting teamwork and collaboration, one participant practiced shared leadership with his staff and ensured that everyone's point of view was taken into account. The findings and the literature is in agreement, which indicates that school leaders should improve their leadership skills in order to change their school climate.

Major Theme 4: Social awareness. Four out of four leaders reported that they used social awareness in their leadership practices. One participant used organizational awareness when practicing social awareness, which took the form of recognizing the different roles that different stakeholders held with respect to the school and guiding those stakeholders accordingly. A social awareness of staff's emotions and moods while under pressure from school reform initiatives can enable principals to more effectively support and coach staff through the process and achieve school wide community and collaboration (Moore, 2009). Another participant used empathy when practicing social awareness. Empathy was also a recurring subject in the first major theme of building relationships. In citing an example of his use of empathy in his

leadership practices, he described his meeting with an indignant parent whose son had broken his arm while running in a school hall. He indicated his clear awareness of the woman's feelings: "I was aware of what she was feeling and the anxiety and the anger over her son's arm in a cast and she needing to blame someone." Similarly, another participant used empathy and service when practicing social awareness, and added that empathy made her acutely aware of the impact of changes on her staff. Mak (2014) identified empathy, noting moods, picking up on nonverbal cues, and paying closer attention to feelings as weaknesses that these successful leaders could improve for stronger social and organizational awareness of the moving parts of a successful school environment. Again, the findings of this study were in agreement with the literature.

Major Theme 5: Self-awareness and self-management. Self-awareness and self-management are combined into one major theme because leaders tended to blend these two domains in their responses. Four out of four school leaders reported that they used self-awareness and self-management in their leadership practices. Wang et al. (2016) found that the more leaders' self-assessment of emotional competence aligned with teachers' assessment of their emotional competence, the greater their degree of transformational leadership. One participant used the self-awareness competency of accurate self-assessment and the self-management competencies of optimism, achievement, and transparency in her leadership practices.

Another participant demonstrated an accurate self-assessment in acknowledging the tendency to procrastinate that manifested itself in his leadership practices. One participant incorporated her transparency into her accurate self-assessment, but, unlike the first two participants, she perceived her transparency as unequivocally positive: "I'm very open, I voice my opinion, I say what I have to say, and I do it in a way that if you...use my name as a handle, it

was ethical, it was professional.” Craig (2008) investigated emotionally intelligent principals and found that they demonstrated the emotional competencies of optimism, emotional self-awareness, empathy, and achievement orientation. The findings of the fifth major theme were corroborated by the literature.

Research Question 3

How do teachers report that school leaders use emotional intelligence when faced with challenges? Results associated with Research Question 3 were derived from four focus groups, one of which was held with subordinates of each of the four leaders who provided interview and survey data. Subordinates who participated in the focus groups indicated that school leaders used EI to manage conflict and resistance and to adapt themselves and help their subordinates adapt to change. Two major themes emerged during data analysis to indicate how teachers reported that school leaders used EI when faced with challenges, including (6) *managing conflict and resistance* and (7) *adapting to change*.

Major Theme 6: Managing conflict and resistance. Participants in four out of four focus groups indicated that school leaders used EI to manage conflicts between staff members and to manage resistance (i.e., conflict between the leader and staff members). According to one focus group, their leader used the self-management competencies of adaptability and transparency, and the relationship management competency of conflict management, to manage conflict and resistance. Goleman’s (1998) identified that EI scores for influence (leader’s ability to persuade in a variety of situations) and conflict management (leader’s ability to understand conflicting viewpoints and acknowledge feelings on all sides while resolve disputes) were the best predictors of the total collective teacher belief score and instructional strategies score. In

agreement, the Leader 2 Focus Group indicated that Leader 2 used conflict management as part of his leadership practices, which was based on listening to staff members' concerns.

The Leader 3 Focus Group indicated that Leader 3 used the relationship management competencies teamwork and collaboration, influence, and conflict management, and the self-management competency adaptability, to manage conflict and resistance. The Leader 4 Focus Group indicated that Leader 4 used the relationship management competencies teamwork and collaboration, influence, inspirational leadership, and conflict management, and the self-management competency adaptability, to manage conflicts and resistance. Research indicated that teamwork, empathy, achievement orientation, and initiative demonstrated by principals was more likely to foster OCB, emphasizing the emotional connectivity and inspiration needed from principals to garner this positive culture and organizational commitment needed for school wide initiatives (such as reform) as seen throughout the literature (Grobler et al., 2017; Kiel et al., 2015; Juma, 2013; Mak, 2014; Pierce, 2014; Taliadorou & Pashiardis, 2015). The findings for this theme were also related to the findings of the themes based on the semi-structured face-to-face interviews with the leaders.

Major Theme 7: Adapting to change. Participants in four out of four focus groups indicated that school leaders used EI to adapt themselves to change, and to help staff members adapt to change by encouraging buy-in. Grunes et al. (2014) were interested in the body of literature that has found EI to produce transformational leadership in non-educational settings and sought to explore predictors of EI that led to transformational leadership in schools. Moore (2009) has asserted that there may be a strong indication that many leaders may not be skilled enough to deal with the emotions and conflicts associated with school reform or to be effective change agents, indicating that EI, as exerted by these leaders, add to their effectiveness as change

agents within a school. School reform in the 21st century requires leaders to transform schools into autonomous, systems-thinking organizations, revolving around professional learning communities that can embrace change and create a high performing learning environment for students and teachers (Moore, 2009).

The Leader 1 Focus Group indicated that in adapting to change Leader 1 used the relationship management competencies inspirational leadership and influence, and the self-management competencies transparency, achievement, emotional self-control, and initiative. The Leader 3 Focus Group indicated that in adapting to change Leader 3 used the relationship management competencies developing others and teamwork and collaboration; the social awareness competency of organizational awareness, and; the self-management competencies transparency, adaptability, initiative, and emotional self-control. The findings of this theme were related to the literature, indicating the importance of EI in leadership to effectively introduce and manage change.

Leader Summaries

Leader 1

Although Leader 1 rated herself “to a certain extent” in regards to the Marzano responsibility *relationship* when she completed the card sort, she indicated that to truly be effective she has to have an emotional connection with her faculty and staff. Data from the card sorting activity implies that Leader 1 does not use *affirmation* and *contingent reward* as often as other responsibilities; however, she seems to understand the importance of valuing people as people and acknowledging the impact of life’s events. The underlying belief that people want to know they are cared about is evidenced in the interactions she has with staff members. To develop an emotional connection with staff members, she shows interest in both work related

topics and the life events staff experience. This builds a sense of community, which lends itself to building a family within the school community and develops bonds. Her intentional development of relationships with staff members facilitates her ability to have very direct and sometimes difficult conversations with staff members.

Building a culture of high expectations and holding people accountable is a strength for Leader 1. She indicated that leadership meant providing guidance and insight while consistently setting expectations in order to leave an organization better than what it was upon the leader's arrival. This correlated to her most frequently used rating in second order change responsibilities *ideals/beliefs* and *monitoring/evaluating*. Focus group members also indicated Leader 1 has strong beliefs about schooling and refuses to not allow students enrolled at her school to get an education that could compete with higher performing schools. Leader 1 was able to *accurately self-assess* and identify that sometimes her vision of what could be tends to make her a taskmaster who does not always stop to praise employees once goals are met. Her desire for students to receive a first-class education and relentless pursuit of excellence sometimes overshadows positive praise to teachers.

She also uses the Goleman relationship management competencies *change catalyst*, *teamwork and collaboration*, and *conflict management* in guiding her staff. Her stated belief that all children should have the best education regardless of where they live drives Leader 1 to be willing to challenge the status quo and act as a change agent for students enrolled at her school even if it means facilitating difficult conversations. Her enactment of the Marzano responsibility of being a *change agent* demonstrated her usage of the EI relationship management competency *change catalyst*. From her previous positions, she gained an understanding of the change process and the resistance that often accompanies school transformation as reform efforts are enacted.

She educates stakeholders on the change process and the integral role that each plays in order to successfully guide them through the transitions that occur within the school. This understanding of how each role factors into the process opens the door for collaboration among community stakeholders.

Although she works to intentionally develop *relationships* with her staff, she does not shy away from difficult conversations. This demonstrates her most frequently used rating of the Marzano responsibility communication. In recognizing that the building can take on the tone of the leader, she has become comfortable with being honest with herself and those who work closely with her in assessing and acknowledging when she may not be at her best. Focus group participants noted growth in the leader's ability to maintain *emotional self-control* and not get excited by occurrences that may have bothered her in the past. Her ability to maintain her composure while being transparent with staff allow them to feel comfortable coming to her concerns. Leader 1 *adapts* her approach to resolving conflict. She is open to receiving feedback - even if it is not in line with her opinions. Her ability to work within the Marzano responsibilities *culture* and *input* are also evidenced as she seeks feedback from staff. She welcomes "push back" since she understands that stakeholders view concerns through different lenses and therefore may have level of insight that was not highlighted before. If given valid and convincing information Leader 1 is willing to enact recommendations. Focus group participants also noted that sometimes if the leader encounters resistance from staff members, she will read the undercurrents and decide if the timing is right to address the issue or table it until a later time.

Leader 1, as well as focus group participants, discussed the leader's ability to resolve conflicts fairly and serve as a mediator when disagreements arise. Both the leader and focus group participants noted that she is able to objectively listen to all parties involved in a

disagreement and help staff members come to a consensus. She is both empathetic and *transparent* as she listens to disagreements. The combination of these competencies allow her to successfully resolve conflicts.

Leader 2

The effective use of emotions is viewed as critically important to leader 2. His past experiences as a teacher who observed fellow staff members being marginalized heavily influence his current practices as a leader. After witnessing the development of low morale in teachers due to the treatment they received from other leaders, he has become intentional about being *empathetic* towards the staff members he leads. Because of his past experiences he decided that under his leadership everyone would “have a seat at the table” and be granted the same level of respect. He expressed *accurate self-assessment* in describing his level of transparency. Although being empathetic is important to him, Leader 2 indicated that he may sometimes be too trusting and *transparent* due to his desire to be empathetic. However, his ability to be transparent and empathetic were viewed positively by focus group participants. These traits, in their opinion, were what contributed to his ability to be fair

Communication is a strength for Leader 2 as evidenced by his rating of most frequently used in the area of communication for the Marzano research-based responsibilities card sort, semi-structured interview responses, and focus group responses. His strong communication skills and actions allow him to demonstrate empathy and facilitate the building of bonds with staff members in order to serve as an inspiration to his team. A point that was noted in both the focus group responses and the responses of the leader himself is that he never asks anyone on his staff to do something that he is not willing to do himself. Focus group members noted that leader 2 was always in the trenches with them. Therefore, if he identified a need, he would assist in any

way possible. His effectiveness is largely influenced by his ability to build positive relationships with staff members.

Leader 2 indicated that while he understands the importance of building relationships and being visible, he must also be able to serve as an instructional leader. He noted that without *knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment* it is hard to be viewed as someone with credibility. Consistently interacting with staff members enables him to identify their areas of strength, as well as areas of need and support them as needed. Leader 2 gets the best out of people he works with by furthering developing their areas of strength and encouraging them to take risks. This was a point that was corroborated by focus group responses. Staff members noted that Leader 2 searched out opportunities to foster professional development in teachers. If they indicated there were areas they wanted to improve upon, Leader 2 assisted them. He reiterates to staff members what they say and provides resources or support to ensure attainment of their goals.

Of the seven responsibilities found to initiate second-order change, Leader 2 rated himself lower, “used to a certain extent”, in the areas of *change agent, intellectual stimulation, and optimizer*. He however rated himself most frequently used in the areas *flexibility, ideals/beliefs, knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, and monitoring/evaluating*. His higher rating in the areas *flexibility* and *ideals/beliefs* align to data gathered from both the leader during his interview, as well as responses from focus group participants. They highlight areas of strength for Leader 2.

The self-confidence of Leader 2 facilitates his ability to work with anyone - even during challenging times. His consistent *communication* with staff members enables him read the undercurrents regarding how staff members view the policies he champions. In adapting to

challenging situations, he uses the self management competencies *transparency* and *emotional self-control* to facilitate difficult conversations and resolve conflicts. He remains composed as a leader. The levelness of his self-control makes him approachable to his staff. This sentiment was echoed by focus group members.

During times when staff members do not complete tasks as expected, Leader 2 gives feedback and guides in a manner that does not belittle. This supported the leader's statement of his intent to never demoralize staff members. Instead of demoralizing staff, he uses the social awareness competency *empathy* and the relationship management competency *developing others* to give corrective feedback when conferencing with teachers followed by collaboratively developing plans of action that will increase the skill sets of his staff. This assists staff in accomplishing goals while creating opportunities for collaboration, which further strengthens his relationships with staff members.

He encourages *teamwork and collaboration* amongst staff members to solve problems. He uses his skill in building effective teams based off each person's strengths to set up structures that allow peers to lend assistance or coaching to each other. The work of the teams is successful due leader 2's careful attention to the needs of his staff and his transparency as he guides them in solving problems.

Leader 3

Leader 3 perceives there is a very strong connection between a leader's effectiveness and EI. He noted that his is a job in which he works with people and therefore can not work in isolation. Leader 3 sees his role as a leader as being supportive of those he leads while providing direction to achieve the school's goals. In order to guide his staff in attaining goals, he keeps

disruptive emotions under control and does not act impulsively. His *optimism* sets the tone for his school and therefore lays a foundation of what is expected.

Leader 3 uses his self-awareness and self-management to gauge his level of interaction with staff members. He realizes that if he takes care of himself and paces the completion of tasks, he frees himself to be amongst his staff. He is then able diminish any feelings of being overwhelmed. Leader 3 noted that he is honest with himself in his self-assessment. Leader 3 also acknowledged that he has a tendency to procrastinate because he wants to ensure that he is making the right decision. He is comfortable in acknowledging what he does or does not do and the extent to which he is involved in activities.

Of the seven Marzano responsibilities found to initiate second-order change, Leader 3 rated himself lowest, rarely used, in the area of *change agent*. *Intellectual stimulation*, *monitoring/evaluating* and *optimizer* received the rating used to a certain extent. He rated himself most frequently used in the areas *flexibility*, *ideals/beliefs*, *knowledge of curriculum*, *instruction*, and *assessment*. His mostly evidenced second order change responsibility is ideals/beliefs.

Communication is also an area of strength for Leader 3. Although he is very measured in the frequency and lack of verbosity in his communication, his staff appreciates his well-timed efforts. Leader 3 is empathic to the demands placed on teachers and does not want to add any unnecessary diversions. He monitors how many emails he sends as well as how many faculty meetings are scheduled. He tries to not have meetings just for the sake of having meetings and values the time of the staff. Responses from focus group participants aligned to these sentiments. They noted that when they have meetings, they know he has something important to share with them.

Leader 3, as evidenced in his card sorting activity, interview responses and focus group responses, uses the Marzano responsibility *input* to address challenges. His usage of this responsibility fosters *teamwork and collaboration* amongst his staff. Leader 3 indicated that he finds himself procrastinating when difficult decisions have to be made. To ensure that he makes a well-informed decision he seeks feedback from both staff members and supervisors. Being *transparent* and involving staff members in the decision-making process lets them know that he values their expertise. Leader 3, as well as focus group members, views his transparency as positive. This further strengthens his bonds with staff members.

In addition to seeking input from staff, Leader 3 is empathetic. He communicates in a non-judgmental manner. If he feels strongly about a concern, he voices his opinion while also considering the views of others who may have a different perspective of others. He is able to communicate his belief that if something could possibly benefit the students or staff, then it should be tried. Since Leader 3 doesn't like to make empty promises to the community or staff, he is also transparent in acknowledging if a practice is not beneficial and needs to be revisited to determine alternative solutions. His ability to be transparent fosters trust with stakeholders.

Leader 4

Leader 4 views leadership as an act of service to others. She indicated that it is extremely important to understand the social and emotional needs of the people that you serve and therefore believes that emotions are a huge factor in the ability to lead. In her role as a leader she provides support in order to build a culture centered around success and develop trust with stakeholders. Leader 4 builds positive relationships and uses empathy in leading her staff. She acknowledges that the leader's behavior sets the tone for the building. How she treats staff members serves as

the example for how students are to be treated. With this in mind, she models the behaviors she would like emulated.

Leader 4 also demonstrated *accurate self-assessment* in acknowledging her transparency about the conviction of her beliefs. Her transparency is viewed positively by both her and the staff. They trust her because they feel they can take what she says at face value. They indicated they perceive she is always looking out for their best interest and has a genuine concern for both their work and personal well-being.

Building relationships is a strength for Leader 4. Her ability to *build bonds* lays the foundation for her work. It is primary in her list of the tools needed to be successful. This is supported by her Marzano card sorting rating of most frequently used, her interview responses, and the responses of the focus group. In building relationships, she is also able to grow her staff and promote self-advocacy and productivity.

Leader 4 uses *teamwork and collaboration* to address anticipated changes with staff members. Including staff in the decision making process encourages buy-in. Leader 4 also employs *empathy* in thinking about how changes might impact staff. She identifies ways to not overburden her staff. In instances that she feels changes would not positively impact her staff she serves as voice for them, advocating for needs of her campus. Due to her attentiveness to their needs she is able to meet their needs and act within the social awareness competency *service*. Because she has such strong ideals/beliefs regarding treatment of staff and the operation of the school, she is able to work within the relationship management domain as an *inspirational leader*. Through her vision she has developed a culture that is so embedded with social awareness competencies of *empathy* and *service* that staff are willing to go the extra mile to ensure the success of the students they serve.

She noted that a leader needs to be relaxed to be clear-headed enough to identify the needs of others. This *emotional self-control* allows her to objectively hear the viewpoints of staff. Leader 4 listens to both sides in resolving conflicts. She gives individuals opportunities to voice concerns in order to create an outcome that works for both parties. Focus group members also indicated that the leader sets clear goals from the onset to help mitigate occurrences of confusion.

Implications of the Findings

The school leaders who were interviewed in this study were all in agreement that emotion definitely influences the emotions of subordinates, as well as the school climate. As such, school leaders may find this research valuable, and may use the findings of this study to make changes in their school. It would first of all be needed for school leaders to make a change within themselves. However, a school leader with a low level of EI may not be willing to make changes to themselves. Nonetheless, leaders who want to make a change in their school can start by trying to be more positive, optimistic, and open-minded, which may escalate to significant change within their school.

The findings of this study and the literature also indicated that certain leadership skills had a positive effect on the collaboration of the school staff, the job satisfaction of subordinates, as well as an indirect influence on the performance of students. School leaders can thus use the findings of this study to make changes in their leadership strategies. School boards could also request that the school leaders take part in a leadership workshop which could be based on the findings of this research.

The findings of this study mostly indicated what leaders can do to foster positive interactions with stakeholders by incorporating EI competencies in their work, which may assist other school leaders to learn from the tactics used by the participants. As such, it may be needed

to include more sufficient material on leadership and EI in the curriculum of students studying to become teachers. Adding to the current curriculum being used to educate future teachers may result in a new generation of teachers, who will become school leaders, to have a better understanding of leadership from the start of their career. Should this be implemented it may have a significant effect on student performance in the long run.

Limitations

The first limitation of the study involved the limited geographical region. Since this research was conducted only within a specific geographical region, it could be argued that school leaders may not be as willing to participate in the study for fear of being identified and receiving negative feedback. However, five participants were the aim for this research, and four school leaders took part in the study. The first limitation was thus not significant, and the data analysis provided rich findings. The second limitation for this study regarded the EI of potential participants. School leaders who perceived that they had low levels of EI may elect not to participate in the study. The second limitation has an influence on the spectrum of the data, as the lack of perception from school leaders with low EI may limit how applicable the study findings are. However, if this limitation is taken into consideration, and the significance of the findings is not exaggerated, the findings for this research are still valuable. The third limitation for this research is the generalizability of the findings. Since the study was conducted in a single geographic region, and only involved four school leaders, the findings may not be generalizable to all school leaders in other regions in the United States. The fourth limitation of the study is a lack of ethnic diversity in the study participants. All school leaders were of African American descent. Therefore since the population was not diverse in nature, this may also impact the

ability to generalize the findings of the study. However, the findings of this research may still be valuable for school leaders in the southeastern region of the United States.

Recommendations for Future Research

The first recommendation for future research is to replicate this study in another region in order to determine differences and similarities between the two or more regions. The findings of such a study may give an indication of the generalizability of the findings for the entire United States. If there are not many differences, it will add to the reliability and significance of the current findings. If there are many differences, it will create more avenues for future research.

Regarding the limitation on the EI level of participants, the second recommendation for future research is to conduct a quantitative study regarding the EI of school leaders. Such a study could incorporate variables such EI, the current job satisfaction of the teachers, and the overall school performance. The analysis of the relationships between these variables will add to the literature regarding the extent of the influence of EI of school leaders. Conducting a quantitative study will also increase the generalizability of the research, as it can include a large number of participants from several regions.

As stated in the interpretation section, further research may be needed to clarify the benchmark for too much emotional self-control, and a healthy level of emotional self-control. The third recommendation for future research is to examine self-control through a mixed-methodology study. This study could employ a survey to determine school leaders' application of emotional self-control in their daily activities, and could then make use of semi-structured face-to-face interviews to determine the perspectives of school leaders on emotional self-control. The data sources can then be compared and synthesized to provide a deeper understanding of self-control and effective leadership.

The last recommendation for future research would be to conduct a mixed-methodology action research study to improve school climate and performance by enhancing the leadership skills and EI of the school leaders. It may be a challenging study to conduct, however, the findings of such a study would be very valuable to the body of literature. The study could include one or two schools that have been consistently lagging behind similar schools in performance.

Conclusion

Researchers of school reform have found that the demands of meeting the current challenges in leading a school oftentimes manifest themselves emotionally in stakeholders in the form of turmoil, resistance, stress, anger, and frustration, as well as other emotions (Blankstein, 2004; Dufour et al., 2008; Moore, 2009). Left unaddressed, the presence of these stressors can have negative effects on the culture of a school. The purpose of this study was thus to examine the practices of school leaders and the role of EI in their work in establishing a school culture. The literature indicated that fostering trust in employees, cultivating a sense of community and ownership, and fostering a support system for faculty and staff in which faculty believed the principal was truly on their side have been significant factors in teacher buy-in improving school performance and reform initiatives (Ashworth, 2013; Barnes, 2015; Jahraus, 2016; Manahan, 2009; Pierce, 2014; Taliadorou and Pashiardis, 2015). This study was guided by three research questions that yielded seven major themes: (1) *building positive relationships*, (2) *setting the emotional tone*, (3) *relationship management*, (4) *social awareness*, (5) *self-awareness and self-management*, (6) *managing conflict and resistance*, and (7) *adapting to change*. The findings of this study resulted in several implications, including suggestions for change in school leaders' emotions and leadership practices. Several recommendations were made for future research, including the replication of this qualitative research in a different region, and a quantitative study

to determine the relationship between EI, job satisfaction, and school performance. This discussion in Chapter 5 concludes the study.

References

- Akomolafe, M., & Adebayo, M. (2012). Assessment of emotional intelligence among secondary school students in Ibadan Metropolis, Oyo State, Nigeria. *Ife Psychologia*, 20(1), 214-228. Retrieved from <https://www.ifepsychologia.org/>
- Akomolafe, M., & Olatomide, O. (2013). Job satisfaction and emotional intelligence as predictors of organizational commitment of secondary school teachers. *Ife Psychologia*, 21(2), 65-74. Retrieved from <https://www.ifepsychologia.org/>
- Andrews, R. L., & Soder, R. (1987). Principal leadership and student achievement. *Educational Leadership*, 44, 9-11. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership.aspx>
- Ashton, P. T., & Webb, R. B. (1986). *Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Ashworth, S. (2013). *The relationship between the emotional intelligence of secondary public school principals and school performance* (Dissertation). Retrieved from Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. (3563469)
- Barnes, C. (2015). *The influence of emotional intelligence on the leadership of effective principals in high performing Title I secondary schools* (Dissertation). Retrieved from Lamar University - Beaumont, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. (3721231)
- Bedessem-Chandler, T. (2014). *Teachers' perceptions of principal leadership based on the 21 responsibilities of a school leader as defined by Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005)* (Dissertation). Retrieved from Edgewood College, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. (3613803)

- Berkovich, I., & Eyal, O. (2017). The mediating role of principals' transformational leadership behaviors in promoting teachers' emotional wellness at work: A study in Israeli primary schools. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 45(2), 316-335. doi:10.1177/1741143215617947
- Berry, P. (2013). *Self-reported emotional intelligence skills among Arizona secondary schools* (Dissertation). Retrieved from Grand Canyon University, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. (3595794)
- Blankstein, A. (2004). *Failure is not an option: Six principles that drive student achievement in high performing schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Block, J. (2014). *Emotional intelligence and principal efficacy: A comparison of South Dakota secondary principals' scores and teachers' perceptions* (Dissertation). Retrieved from University of South Dakota, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. (3685678)
- Boggan, J. P. (2014). *Focus and priority schools: How principals enact leadership responsibilities to increase student achievement in selected mid-western counties* (Dissertation). Retrieved from Western Michigan University Dissertations. (Paper 236)
- Bradberry, T., & Greaves, J. (2005). *Emotional intelligence appraisal: There is more than IQ*, San Diego, CA: Talent Smart.
- Brinia, V., Zimianiti, L., & Panagiotopoulos, K. (2014). The role of the principal's emotional intelligence in primary education leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42(4), 28-44. doi:10.1177/1741143213513183
- Bumphus, A. (2008). *The emotional intelligence and resilience of school leaders: An investigation into leadership behaviors* (Dissertation). Retrieved from The University of Southern Mississippi, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. (3329731)

- Cheng, K. (2014). A study on applying focus group interview on education. *Reading Improvement, 51*(4), 381-384. Retrieved from <http://www.projectinnovation.biz/ri.html>
- Chong, A., Lee, P., Roslan, S., & Baba, M. (2015). Emotional intelligence and at-risk students. *SAGE Open, 5*(1), 1-8. doi:10.1177/2158244014564768
- Ciarrochi, J., & Mayer, J. (Eds.). (2007). *Applying emotional intelligence: A practitioners guide*. New York, NY: Psychology Press/Taylor & Francis.
- Cliffe, J. (2011). Emotional intelligence: A study of female secondary school headteachers. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 39*(2), 205-218. doi:10.1177/1741143210390057
- Cohen, K. (2013). *Characteristics of and strategies used by principals who promote academic success in Title I classified schools* (Dissertation). Retrieved from Lindenwood University, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. (3556962)
- Cosner, S., & Jones, M. (2016). Leading school-wide improvement in low-performing schools facing conditions of accountability: Key actions and considerations. *Journal of Educational Administration, 54*(1), 41-57. doi:10.1108/JEA-08-2014-0098
- Craig, C. J. (2008). Joseph Schwab, self-study of teaching and teacher education practices proponent? A personal perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(8), 1993-2001. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2008.05.008
- Creighton, T. (2005). *Leading from below the surface: A non-traditional approach to school leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory Into Practice*, 39(3), 124-130. doi:10.1207/s15430421tip3903_2
- Crow, G. M. (2006). Complexity and the beginning principal in the United States: Perspectives on socialization. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44(4), 338- 356.
doi:10.1108/09578230610674930
- Daneshmand, B. (2013). Emotional intelligence and its necessity in teaching training. *International Journal of Economy, Management and Social Sciences*, 2(10), 899-904.
Retrieved from <http://www.tijournals.com/>
- Dauids, K. (2016). *Sine qua non: Emotional intelligence as the key ingredient to effective principal leadership* (Dissertation). Retrieved from Brandman University, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. (10142764)
- Day, C., & Sammons, P. (2013). *Successful leadership: A review of the international literature*. London, England: CfBT Education Trust.
- DeFranco, J. A., & Golden, N. L. (2003). *Educational leadership improvement tool: A research-based assessment, evaluation, & improvement tool for school administrators*. Eugene, OR: Eugene School District.
- Döş, I., & Savaş, A. (2015). Elementary school administrators and their roles in the context of effective schools. *SAGE Open*, 5, 1-11. doi:10.1177/2158244014567400
- Druskat, V. U., & Wolff, S. B. (2001). Building the emotional intelligence of groups. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(3), 80-90. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/>
- Dufour, R., Dufour, R., & Eaker, R. (2008). *Revisiting professional learning community at work: New insights for improving schools*. Bloomington, IN: Solution-Tree.

- Ekegren, M., & Dåderman, A. M. (2015). Leadership intelligence before and after participation in UGL leadership training. *International Journal of Transpersonal Studies*, 34(1), 20-23. doi:10.24972/ijts.2015.34.1-2.23
- Elmore, R. F., Forman, M. L., Stosich, E. L., & Bocala, C. (2014). *The internal coherence assessment protocol & developmental framework: Building the organizational capacity for instructional improvement in schools* (Research paper). Washington, DC: Strategic Education Research Partnership.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gaddis, A. (2016). *Teacher organizational citizenship behavior and principal emotional intelligence: How they relate and interact* (Dissertation). Retrieved from Kansas University ScholarWorks. (1808/22032)
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Galletta, A. (2013). *Mastering the semi-structured interview and beyond: From research design to analysis and publication*. NY: New York University press.
- Gardner, D. P., Larsen, Y. W., Baker, W., Campbell, A., & Crosby, E. A. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Geijsel, F., Slegers, P., Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2003). Transformational leadership effects on teachers' commitment and effort toward school reform. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41(3), 228-256. doi:10.1108/09578230310474403
- Goleman, D. P. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ for character, health and lifelong achievement*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.

- Goleman, D. P. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York, NY: Bantam.
- Goleman, D. P. (2000). An EI-based theory of performance. In D. Goleman & C. Cherniss (Eds.), *The emotionally intelligent workplace: How to select for, measure, and improve emotional intelligence in individuals, groups, and organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Goleman, D. P., Boyatzis, R. E., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.
- Goodwin, J., & Babo, G. (2014). What expert teachers think: A look at principal leadership behaviors that facilitate exemplary classroom instructional practice. *NCPEA Education Leadership Review of Doctoral Research*, 1(2), 65-84. Retrieved from <http://www.ncpeapublications.org/>
- Grobler, B. (2014). Teachers' perceptions of the utilization of emotional competence by their school leaders in Gauteng, South Africa. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42(6), 868-888. doi:10.1177/1741143213513184
- Grobler, B., Moloi, C., & Thakhordas, S. (2017). Teachers' perceptions of the utilization of emotional intelligence by their school principals to manage mandated curriculum change processes. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 45(2), 336-355. doi:10.1177/1741143215608197
- Grunes, P., Gudmundsson, A., & Irmer, B. (2014). To what extent is the Mayer and Salovey (1997) model of emotional intelligence a useful predictor of leadership style and perceived leadership outcomes in Australian educational institutions? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42(1), 112-135. doi:10.1177/1741143213499255

- Hanlin, D. (2014). *The relationship between emotional intelligence and research-based leadership practices of high school principals* (Dissertation). Retrieved from University of Maryland, College Park, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. (3643956)
- Harney, E. (2015). *Correlation of emotional intelligence of school leaders and school climate: Across-cultural comparison between American and South Korean schools* (Dissertation). Retrieved from Indiana University of Pennsylvania, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. (3700978)
- Heller, R. (2017). On the science and teaching of emotional intelligence. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 98(6), 20-24. doi:10.1177/0031721717696473
- Hessel, K., & Holloway, J. (2002). *A framework for school leaders: Linking the standards to practice*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Hitt, D., & Tucker, P. (2016). Systematic review of key leader practices found to influence student achievement: A unified framework. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(2), 531-569. doi:10.3102/0034654315614911
- Jahraus, L. (2016). *The relationship between the emotional intelligence of an elementary school principal, the level of school academic optimism, and school achievement* (Dissertation). Retrieved from University of Montana, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. (10128772)
- Jamali D., Sidani Y., & Abu-Zaki D. (2008). Emotional intelligence and management development implications: Insights from the Lebanese context. *Journal of Management Development*, 27(3), 348-360. doi:10.1108/02621710810858641
- Ju, C., Lan, J., Li, Y., Feng, W., & You, X. (2015). The mediating role of workplace social support on the relationship between trait emotional intelligence and teacher burnout. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 51, 58-67. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2015.06.001

- Juma, D. (2013). *The relationship between emotional intelligence of principals and the overall organizational climate of public elementary schools* (Dissertation). Retrieved from Grand Canyon University, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. (3564904)
- Kearney, W., Kelsey, C., & Sinkfield, C. (2014). Emotionally intelligent leadership: An analysis of targeted interventions for aspiring school leaders in Texas. *Planning and Changing*, 45(1/2), 31. Retrieved from <https://education.illinoisstate.edu/planning/>
- Kiel, L. D., Bezboruah, K., & Oyun, G. (2009). Developing leaders in public affairs and administration: Incorporating emotional intelligence training into the core doctoral leadership course. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 15, 87-105. Retrieved from <http://www.naspaa.org/initiatives/jpae/jpae.asp>
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1995). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2012). *The leadership challenge: How to make extraordinary things happen in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2009). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Labby, S., Lunenburg, F. C., & Slate, J. R. (2012). Emotional intelligence and academic success: A conceptual analysis for educational leaders. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 7, 1-11. Retrieved from <http://www.ncpeapublications.org>
- Leithwood, K. A., & Jantzi, D. (2000). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 112-129. doi:10.1108/09578230010320064
- Lezotte, L. (1997). *Learning for all*. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products.

- Li, Y., & Lerner, R. (2013). Interrelations of behavioral, emotional, and cognitive school engagement in high school students. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 42(1), 20-32. doi:10.1007/s10964-012-9857-5
- Liamputtong, P. (2011). *Focus group methodology: Principles and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lingam, G. I., & Lingam, N. (2015). Are they fit for leading? Teachers' perceptions of leadership practices of Niuean school principals. *International Studies in Educational Administration (Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration & Management (CCEAM))*, 43(1), 35-47. Retrieved from <https://www.cceam.org/index.php?id=6>
- Louis, K., Leithwood, K., Walhstrom, K., & Anderson, S. (2010). *Learning from leadership: Investigating the links to improved student learning*. Minneapolis: Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement, University of Minnesota, and Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto.
- Louis, K., & Marks, H. (1998). Does professional communities affect the classroom? Teachers' work and student experiences in restructuring schools. *American Journal of Education*, 106, 532-574. doi:10.1086/444197
- Mak, R. (2014). *The relationship between emotional intelligence and the success of high school principals who have been awarded the Illinois Principals Association's High School Principal of the Year Award* (Dissertation). Retrieved from Digital Commons, Loyola University Chicago. (903)
- Manahan, R. (2009). *The other side of leadership: An examination of strategies and protocols for developing emotional intelligence in school administrators* (Dissertation). Retrieved from University of Washington, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. (3370523)

- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Matešić, K. (2015). The relationship between cognitive and emotional intelligence and high school academic achievement. *Collegium Antropologicum*, 39(2), 371-375. Retrieved from <http://www.collantropol.hr/antropo>
- Maulding, W., Peters, G., Roberts, J., Leonard, E., & Sparkman, L. (2012). Emotional intelligence and resilience as predictors of leadership in school administrators. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 5(4), 20-29. doi:10.1002/jls.20240
- Mayer, J. D. (1999). *Emotional intelligence: Popular or scientific psychology?* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2004). Emotional Intelligence: Theory, findings, and implications. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(3), 197-215. doi:10.1207/s15327965pli1503_02
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. New York, NY: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Moore, B. (2009a). Emotional intelligence for school administrators: A priority for school reform?. *American Secondary Education*, 37(3), 20-28. Retrieved from <https://www.ashland.edu/coe/about-college/american-secondary-education-journal>
- Moore, B. (2009b). *Inspire, motivate, collaborate: Leading with emotional intelligence*. Westerville, OH: National Middle School Association.

- Nafukho, F., Muyia, M., Farnia, F., Kacirek, K., & Lynham, S. (2016). Developing emotional intelligence skills among practicing leaders: Reality or myth?. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 29(1), 71-87. doi:10.1002/piq.21215
- Nathanson, L., Rivers, S., Flynn, L., & Brackett, M. (2016). Creating emotionally intelligent schools with RULER. *Emotion Review*, 8, 305-310. doi:10.1177/1754073916650495
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (2015). *Professional standards for educational leaders 2015*. Reston, VA: Author.
- Nelson, D. B., & Low, G. R. (2011). *Emotional intelligence* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Prentice Hall.
- Palmer, B. (2003). An analysis of the relationships between various models and measures of emotional intelligence. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 10(4), 302-326. Retrieved from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journal/ijoa>
- Pashiardis, P. (2011). A validation study of the leadership styles of a holistic leadership theoretical framework. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 25(1), 11-32. doi:10.1108/09513541111100099
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pierce, S. (2014). Examining the relationship between collective teacher efficacy and the emotional intelligence of elementary school principals. *Journal of School Leadership*, 24(2), 311-335. Retrieved from <http://rowman.com/Page/Journals>
- Reyes, M., Brackett, M., Rivers, S., White, M., & Salovey, P. (2012). Classroom emotional climate, student engagement, and academic achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104(3), 700-712. doi:10.1037/a0027268

- Sadri, G. (2011). Emotional intelligence: Can it be taught? *Training and Development*, 65(9), 84-85. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/journals/train-dev-j/>
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 9, 185-211. doi:10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG
- Segredo, M. (2014). *The relationships between elementary school principals' emotional intelligence, leadership style and school culture* (Dissertation). Retrieved from Digital Commons, Florida International University. (AAI3644805)
- Summers, R. (2015). *The superintendent as transformational leader: A case study analysis of the strategies, initiatives and processes used by superintendents of exemplar 21st century school districts to implement district-wide change for the 21st century* (Dissertation). Retrieved from Brandman University, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. (3688378)
- Sun, J., & Leithwood, K. (2015). Leadership effects on student learning mediated by teacher emotions. *Societies*, 5, 566-582. doi:10.3390/soc5030566
- Taliadorou, N., & Pashiardis, P. (2015). Examining the role of emotional intelligence and political skill to educational leadership and their effects to teachers' job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 53(5), 642-666. doi:10.1108/JEA-02-2014-0025
- Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Alessandro, A. (2013). A review of school climate research. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(3), 357-385. doi:10.3102/0034654313483907
- Thorndike, R. K. (1920). Intelligence and its uses. *Harper's Magazine*, 140, 227-335. Retrieved from <https://harpers.org/>
- Vahedi, M., & Nikdel, H. (2011). Emotional intelligence, parental involvement and academic achievement. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 30, 331-335. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.10.065

- Wang, N., Wilhite, S., & Martino, D. (2016). Understanding the relationship between school leaders' social and emotional competence and their transformational leadership: The importance of self–other agreement. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 44(3), 467-490. doi:10.1177/1741143214558568
- Waters J. T., Marzano R. J., & McNulty B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Yamamoto, J., Gardiner, M., & Tenuto, P. (2014). Emotion in leadership: Secondary school administrators' perceptions of critical incidents. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42(2), 165-183. doi:10.1177/1741143213499260
- Yusof, H. M., Kadir, H. A., & Mahfar, M. (2014). The role of emotions in leadership. *Asian Social Science*, 10(10), 41-49. doi:10.5539/ass.v10n10p41

APPENDIX A

LETTER OF INVITATION TO PRINCIPALS

Dear Principal:

I am currently an Instructional Coach and Ed.D. candidate at Georgia Southern University in the department of Educational Leadership. I would like to invite you to participate in a doctoral dissertation research study I am conducting to complete the requirements necessary to obtain my doctoral degree.

The purpose of this study is to examine the practices of school leaders and the role of emotional intelligence in their work. Your participation in this study is voluntary, however, your assistance is needed to provide information that can help you and other school leaders in completing the challenging task of leading school reform efforts and the vast responsibilities associated with implementing these efforts to increase student achievement. There is no known risk for your participation and any information related to you or your school will be completely confidential.

I ask you take about ten (10) minutes to complete a demographic survey and answer four open-ended questions. I would also like to meet with you for approximately 60 minutes to ask 11 interview questions that will be audio-recorded and administer a leadership activity linked specifically to Marzano's leadership responsibilities. I ask that you be willing to be contacted after the interview to answer clarifying questions and review the interview transcript for accuracy. This information will be confidential and will not be shared or linked to you or your school in any form at any time.

Please allow me to work with five teachers on your staff who have worked with you for at least two years to conduct a focus group. Through engaging teachers in a focus group discussion, this study seeks to identify how school leaders use emotional intelligence when faced with challenges. I ask you to forward a recruitment email that explains the purpose of this study to teachers in your building or allow me to directly contact the staff members via email to distribute the invitation to participate. Participation is voluntary for them and will take 60-90 minutes.

Your support and participation would be greatly appreciated. If you have questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at tl00774@georgiasouthern.edu, tmason@atlanta.k12.ga.us, or by phone at 404-520-4516.

Kindest Regards,
Tanzy Mason Doctoral Candidate
Georgia Southern University



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF LEADERSHIP, TECHNOLOGY, AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

APPENDIX B

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE: PRINCIPALS INFORMED CONSENT

By signing below, participants understand that they will participate in a research study with Tanzy Mason, a doctoral candidate in the Department of Leadership, Technology, and Human Development. The researcher is committed to supporting the academic achievement of students, and interested in the role of educational leaders in ensuring the academic success of students.

The purpose of this study is to examine the practices of school leaders and the role of emotional intelligence in their work. This study will focus on capturing and describing their experiences in order to assist other educational leaders faced with leading school reform efforts. This information will be obtained from school leaders at five schools who agree to participate in a 60 minute interview. The design of the study may solicit your participation in further data collection via follow-up conversations. The interviews will be conducted at a location agreed upon by the participant and the researcher.

Risks involved in this study are minimal, and may include slight discomfort or sensitivity related to answering questions about leadership practices.

Participants may benefit by contributing to the body of research regarding school leadership practices, specifically the role of emotions in the work of school leaders, and how it may or may not affect school reform efforts.

The benefits to society are to include identified strategies and recommendations for school leadership practices supported by empirical research, and ultimately improvement of academic achievement for students.

Time required from participants is approximately 10 minutes for completion of a brief demographic questionnaire, and 60 minutes to conduct an interview.

Tanzy Mason will have primary access to data that is produced from the interview for the research study; however, advising committee members, or Institutional Review Board members Georgia Southern University may have access to make sure the researcher has followed regulatory requirements. To ensure that the collected research data is confidential and cannot be

linked to specific subjects, the names of the participants will not be written on the interview data. Participant name and identifying information will be given a pseudonym, and only the principal investigator will know the true identities of the study participants. All data will be held in the strictest confidentiality by the researcher, will be stored in a secured lock box for 3 years after the study is completed, and at this time all data will be destroyed. All interview transcripts will be password protected in data files in a locked cabinet and that only the principal investigator will have access to these files.

Right to Ask Questions: Participants have the right to ask questions and have those questions answered. If you have questions about this study, please contact the researcher named above or the researcher's faculty advisor, whose contact information is located at the end of the informed consent. For questions concerning your rights as a research participant, contact Georgia Southern University Office of Research

Services and Sponsored Programs at 912-478-0843. There is no compensation for participation in the study.

Participation in the study is voluntary, participants have the right to withdraw from the study at any time, and withdrawal will not affect employment or benefits. Also, participants may choose not to answer any questions that will make them uncomfortable and no consequences will occur. Participation may be terminated due to not answering questions; however, there will not be any consequences in doing so.

Participants will not be penalized if they decide not to participate in the study.

You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to participate in this research study. If you consent to participate in this research study and to the terms above, please sign your name and indicate the date below.

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records. This project has been reviewed and approved by the GSU Institutional Review Board under tracking number H18076.

Title of Project: EMOTIONALLY CONNECTED: THE ROLE OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE WORK OF SCHOOL LEADERS

Principal Investigator:
Tanzy Mason
4540 Ben Hill Road
Atlanta, GA 30349
404-520-4516
tl00774@georgiasouthern.edu

Faculty Advisor:
Dr. Kymberly Harris
P.O. Box: 8134
Georgia Southern University
Statesboro, GA 30460
912-478-5041
kharris@georgiasouthern.edu

Participant Signature

Date

I, the undersigned, verify that the above informed consent procedure has been followed.

Investigator Signature

Date

APPENDIX C

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN FOCUS GROUP

Dear Teacher:

My name is Tanzy Mason. I am a doctoral student at Georgia Southern University. In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, I am conducting a research study entitled: Emotionally Connected: The Role of Emotional Intelligence in the Work of School Leaders.

The purpose of this research is to examine the practices of school leaders and the role of emotional intelligence in their work. Through engaging teachers in a focus group discussion, this study seeks to identify how school leaders use emotional intelligence when faced with challenges.

You are invited to participate in this research study because you are a teacher who has worked with your school leader for at least two years. Although your participation in this study is voluntary and not required, I hope that you will consider participating.

The focus group discussion will be scheduled at a convenient time and location for the participants. During the discussion, participants will be asked to share their experiences and observations of how school leaders use emotional intelligence when faced with challenges. The discussion may take 60-90 minutes and will be audio-recorded.

I will serve as the moderator during the focus group discussion by asking the participants open-ended questions. As a participant, you do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to answer. In addition, you may withdraw or decline participation at any time.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please notify me by email at tl00774@georgiasouthern.edu or tmason@atlanta.k12.ga.us. I hope that you will agree to participate in this study because I believe your perspective can be beneficial in examining the role of emotional intelligence in the work of school leaders.

Your support and participation would be greatly appreciated. If you have questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at tl00774@georgiasouthern.edu or tmason@atlanta.k12.ga.us.

Kindest Regards,
Tanzy Mason



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF LEADERSHIP, TECHNOLOGY, AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

APPENDIX D

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE: FOCUS GROUP

FOCUS GROUP CONSENT FORM: Adult Participation in a Focus Group

My name is Tanzy Mason. I am a doctoral student at Georgia Southern University. In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, I am conducting a research study entitled: Emotionally Connected: The Role of Emotional Intelligence in the Work of School Leaders.

The purpose of this research is to examine the practices of school leaders and the role of emotional intelligence in their work. Through engaging teachers in a focus group discussion, this study seeks to identify how school leaders use emotional intelligence when faced with challenges.

If you are a teacher who has worked with your school leader for at least two years, you are invited to participate in this research study. Although your participation in this study is voluntary and not required, I hope that you will consider participating. I will serve as the moderator during the discussion by asking participants open-ended questions. Participants will be encouraged to share their thoughts. However, as a participant, you do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to answer. In addition, you may withdraw or decline participation at any time. The focus group discussion may take between 60-90 minutes. I will record the focus group discussion. As the focus group session occurs, I will also take notes to capture important moments and points of emphasis. Additional questions may be asked when appropriate to clarify understanding as needed. Careful attention will be given to promote the security of the research and confidentiality of research participants. The following steps will be taken to protect the participants' confidentiality. 1. Access to files from the focus group will be password protected with a secure password. 2. The recording device will be kept in a locked file cabinet in the researcher's home. 3. Pseudonyms will be assigned to each participant in the study as well as the schools and school districts. Participants will not be identified by name in subsequent documents or transcriptions. 4. Focus group transcriptions, notes, and subsequent documents will be secured on the researcher's personal computer with password protection to prevent unauthorized users from accessing data. 5. Files, notes, and transcriptions will be destroyed after three years.

This study does not present any greater psychological, emotional, or physical risks beyond the normal risks experienced by educators in their daily routine.

There is no direct benefit to you for participating in the study. However, information obtained from the study may provide valuable knowledge that can be used school leaders and stakeholders to successfully implement school reform efforts and positively impact student achievement.

Right to Ask Questions: Participants have the right to ask questions and have those questions answered. If you have questions about this study, please contact the researcher named above or the researcher's faculty advisor, whose contact information is located at the end of the informed consent. For questions concerning your rights as a research participant, contact Georgia Southern University Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs at 912-478-0843.

There is no compensation for participation in the study.

Participation in the study is voluntary, participants have the right to withdraw from the study at any time, and withdrawal will not affect employment or benefits. Also, participants may choose not to answer any questions that will make them uncomfortable and no consequences will occur. Participation may be terminated due to not answering questions; however, there will not be any consequences in doing so.

Participants will not be penalized if they decide not to participate in the study.

You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to participate in this research study. If you consent to participate in this research study and to the terms above, please sign your name and indicate the date below.

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records. This project has been reviewed and approved by the GSU Institutional Review Board under tracking number H18076.

Title of Project: EMOTIONALLY CONNECTED: THE ROLE OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE WORK OF SCHOOL LEADERS

Principal Investigator:
Tanzy Mason
4540 Ben Hill Road
Atlanta, GA 30349
404-520-4516
tl00774@georgiasouthern.edu

Faculty Advisor:
Dr. Kymberly Harris
P.O. Box: 8134
Georgia Southern University
Statesboro, GA 30460
912-478-5041
kharris@georgiasouthern.edu

Participant Signature

Date

I, the undersigned, verify that the above informed consent procedure has been followed.

Investigator Signature

Date

APPENDIX E
 PROTOCOL ALIGNMENT MATRIX

Question #1 How do school leaders view the role of emotions in the execution of their duties?	
Principal Interview Protocol Questions	Alignment to Goleman Domain/Competency
1. Some would say there is no connection between a school leader's level of emotional intelligence and level of effectiveness. What would you tell them?	
2. How does your emotional state influence your interactions in the workplace?	Self Management/Emotional Self Control
3. What strategies, if any, do you use to keep disruptive emotions and impulses under control?	Self Management/Emotional Self-Control; Self-Awareness/Accurate Self-Assessment
4. Describe a time when your level of optimism impacted your ability to lead?	Goleman Self Management - Optimism
5. In your opinion, how does your drive to improve your performance guide your work?	Goleman Self Management - Achievement
Question #2 What characteristics of emotional intelligence do school leaders report when they describe their leadership practices?	
Principal Interview Protocol Questions	Alignment to Goleman Domain/Competency
6. How would you define leadership?	
7. What do you see is your role as a leader?	

8. How does your level of transparency impact your ability to guide and motivate staff with whom you work?	Self Management/Transparency; Relationship Management/Influence; Relationship Management/Inspirational Leadership
9. In what ways do you promote teamwork and collaboration in your role as a school leader?	Relationship Management/Teamwork and Collaboration Relationship Management/Building Bonds
10. What would you say are your strengths and weaknesses as a leader?	Self-Awareness/Accurate Self-Assessment
11. How do you encourage staff members to buy into new school initiatives that may not align with past practices?	Relationship Management/Change Catalyst; Relationship Management/Influence; Social Awareness/Organizational Awareness
Question #3 How do teachers report that school leaders use emotional intelligence when faced with challenges?	
Focus Group Protocol Questions	Alignment to Goleman Domain/Competency
1. Please review the brief overview of the twenty-one leadership responsibilities and tell me which, if any, you think is most important and why.	
2. Please review the brief overview of the emotional intelligence domains and tell me which, if any, you	

think is most important and why.	
3. When in a stressful situation what does your leader do?	Self Management/Emotional Self-Control; Self Management/Adaptability
4. What happens when your leader encounters resistance?	Social Awareness/Service; Social Awareness/Empathy; Social Awareness/Influence; Social Awareness/Inspirational Leadership;
5. How does your leader encourage staff members to buy into new school initiatives that may not align with past practices?	Relationship Management/Change Catalyst; Relationship Management/ Influence; Social Awareness/Organizational Awareness
6. How does your leader stay attuned to the culture of the school and adapt to needs as they change?	Social Awareness/Organizational Awareness; Social Awareness/Service; Self Management/Adaptability
7. What specific steps has your leader taken to manage conflict among staff members?	Relationship Management/Conflict Management;

APPENDIX F

LEADER QUESTIONNAIRE

This study seeks to explore the role of emotional intelligence in the work of school leaders. This questionnaire is to be completed by school leaders. As part of the study, participants' demographic data may be needed to help interpret information gained during this study. This demographic profile is included to help ascertain information that may not be revealed in the interview. Participants are asked to complete and return this form. All information you provide will remain confidential.

1. What is your age? _____
2. What is your gender?
 - _____ Male
 - _____ Female
 - _____ Other
3. What is your ethnicity?
 - _____ Asian
 - _____ African American
 - _____ Caucasian, Non-Hispanic or Latino
 - _____ Hispanic or Latino
 - _____ Other
4. What is your highest education level completed?
 - _____ Bachelor's Degree
 - _____ Master's Degree
 - _____ Specialist Degree
 - _____ Doctoral Degree
5. How many years were you a classroom teacher? _____
6. How many total years of leadership experience do you have? _____
7. How long have you been a principal in your current building? _____
8. What other leadership positions have you held? Please indicate the length of time you worked in each position.
9. Did your previous work experiences influence how you execute your current duties? If so, how?
10. Please review the brief overview of the twenty-one leadership responsibilities and tell me which, if any, you think are most important and why.
11. Please review the brief overview of the emotional intelligence domains and tell me which competencies, if any, you think are most important and why.

APPENDIX G

MARZANO, WATERS, AND MCNULTY (2005) LEADERSHIP RESPONSIBILITIES

Marzano Research-Based Responsibility	Description
(1) Affirmation	Recognizes and celebrates accomplishments and acknowledges failure
(2) Change Agent	Is willing to challenge and actively challenges the status quo
(3) Contingent Reward	Recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments
(4) Communication	Establishes strong lines of communication with and among teachers and students
(5) Culture	Fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation
(6) Discipline	Protects teachers from issues and influences that would detract from their teaching time or focus
(7) Flexibility	Adapts his or her leadership behavior to the needs of the current situation and is comfortable with dissent
(8) Focus	Establishes clear goals and keeps those goals in the forefront of the school's attention
(9) Ideals/Beliefs	Communicates and operates from strong ideals and beliefs about schooling
(10) Input	Involves teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies
(11) Intellectual stimulation	Ensures faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices and makes the discussion of these a regular aspect of the school's culture
(12) Involvement in curriculum, instruction, and assessment	Is directly involved in the design and implementation of curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices
(13) Knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment	Is knowledgeable about current curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices
(15) Optimizer	Inspires and leads new and challenging innovations
(16) Order	Establishes a set of standard operating procedures and routines

(17) Outreach	Is an advocate and spokesperson for the school to all stakeholders
(18) Relationships	Demonstrates an awareness of the personal aspects of teachers and staff
(19) Resources	Provides teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their jobs
(20) Situational Awareness	Is aware of the details and undercurrents in the running of the school and uses this information to address current and potential problems
(21) Visibility	Has quality contact and interactions with teachers and students

APPENDIX H

GOLEMAN (1998) EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE DOMAINS AND COMPETENCIES

<p>Self Awareness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Emotional self-awareness</i>: Reading one's own emotions and recognizing their impact; using "gut sense" to guide decisions • <i>Accurate self-assessment</i>: Knowing one's strengths and limits • <i>Self-confidence</i>: A sound sense of one's self-worth and capabilities 	<p>Social Awareness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Empathy</i>: Sensing others' emotions, understanding their perspective, and taking active interest in their concerns • <i>Organizational awareness</i>: Reading the currents, decision networks, and politics at the organizational level • <i>Service</i>: Recognizing and meeting follower, client, or customer needs
<p>Self Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Emotional self-control</i>: Keeping disruptive emotions and impulses under control • <i>Transparency</i>: Displaying honesty and integrity; trustworthiness • <i>Adaptability</i>: Flexibility in adapting to changing situations or overcoming obstacles • <i>Achievement</i>: The drive to improve performance to meet inner standards of excellence • <i>Initiative</i>: Readiness to act and seize opportunities • <i>Optimism</i>: Seeing the upside in events 	<p>Relationship Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Inspirational leadership</i>: Guiding and motivating with a compelling vision • <i>Influence</i>: Wielding a range of tactics for persuasion • <i>Developing others</i>: Bolstering others' abilities through feedback • <i>Change catalyst</i>: Initiating, managing, and leading in a new direction • <i>Conflict management</i>: Resolving disagreements • <i>Building bonds</i>: Cultivating and maintaining a web of relationships • <i>Teamwork and collaboration</i>: Cooperation and team building

APPENDIX I

PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP CARD SORTING ACTIVITY

Marzano Research-Based Responsibility	Description	Most Frequently Used	Used to a Certain Extent	Rarely Used
(1) Affirmation	Recognizes and celebrates accomplishments and acknowledges failure			
(2) Change Agent	Is willing to challenge and actively challenges the status quo			
(3) Contingent Reward	Recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments			
(4) Communication	Establishes strong lines of communication with and among teachers and students			
(5) Culture	Fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation			
(6) Discipline	Protects teachers from issues and influences that would detract from their teaching time or focus			
(7) Flexibility	Adapts his or her leadership behavior to the needs of the current situation and is comfortable with dissent			
(8) Focus	Establishes clear goals and keeps those goals in the forefront of the school's attention			
(9) Ideals/Beliefs	Communicates and operates from strong ideals and beliefs about schooling			
(10) Input	Involves teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies			
(12) Involvement in curriculum, instruction, and assessment	Is directly involved in the design and implementation of curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices			
(13) Knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment	Is knowledgeable about current curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices			

(14) Monitoring/ Evaluating	Monitors the effectiveness of school practices and their impact on student learning			
(15) Optimizer	Inspires and leads new and challenging innovations			
(16) Order	Establishes a set of standard operating procedures and routines			
(17) Outreach	Is an advocate and spokesperson for the school to all stakeholders			
(18) Relationships	Demonstrates an awareness of the personal aspects of teachers and staff			
(19) Resources	Provides teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their jobs			
(20) Situational Awareness	Is aware of the details and undercurrents in the running of the school and uses this information to address current and potential problems			
(21) Visibility	Has quality contact and interactions with teachers and students			

APPENDIX J

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Participant: _____

Place: _____

Date: _____

Time of Interview: _____

Introductory Comments:

I would like to thank you for taking the time to meet with me today. The purpose of this interview is to gather information about the role of emotional intelligence in your leadership practices. This interview will last approximately 45 minutes to 1 hour and will be audio recorded to ensure the accuracy of your story. Your participation is voluntary and you may stop the interview or refuse to respond to any question at any time. All of your responses will remain confidential as will your identity and school district. Please elaborate on specific details during the course of the interview. Please do not provide any identifying information. Please be honest, candid, and accurate as you respond to the questions. Are there any questions regarding the conditions of this interview?

1. How would you define leadership?
2. What do you see is your role as a leader?
3. What would you say are your strengths and weaknesses as a leader?
4. In what ways do you promote teamwork and collaboration in your role as a school leader?
5. How do you encourage staff members to buy into new school initiatives that may not align with past practices?
6. How does your level of transparency impact your ability to guide and motivate staff with whom you work?
7. Some would say there is no connection between a school leader's level of emotional intelligence and level of effectiveness. What would you tell them?
8. What strategies, if any, do you use to keep disruptive emotions and impulses under control?
9. How does your emotional state influence your interactions in the workplace?
10. Describe a time when your level of optimism impacted your ability to lead?
11. In your opinion, how does your drive to improve your performance guide your work?

Concluding Comments: I would like to thank you for sharing your experiences with me. Your interview will be transcribed and a copy for your review can be provided. I will also contact you via telephone should we need to schedule follow-up interviews.

Thank you.

APPENDIX K

FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL

Introductory Comments:

I would like to thank you for taking the time to meet with me today. The purpose of this interview is to gather information about how your leader uses emotional intelligence when faced with challenges. This interview will last approximately 60-90 minutes and will be audio recorded to ensure the accuracy of your story. Your participation is voluntary and you may stop the interview or refuse to respond to any question at any time. All of your responses will remain confidential as will your identity and school district. Please elaborate on specific details during the course of the interview. Please do not provide any identifying information. Please be advised that although researchers will take every precaution to maintain confidentiality of data, the nature of focus groups prevents researchers from guaranteeing confidentiality. Please maintain the confidentiality of the focus group by not sharing what is discussed in the focus group with others outside of the focus group. Please be honest, candid, and accurate as you respond to the questions. Are there any questions regarding the conditions of this interview?

1. Please review the brief overview of the twenty-one leadership responsibilities and tell me which, if any, you think is most important and why.
2. Please review the brief overview of the emotional intelligence domains and tell me which, if any, you think is most important and why.
3. When in a stressful situation what does your leader do?
4. What happens when your leader encounters resistance?
5. How does your leader encourage staff members to buy into new school initiatives that may not align with past practices?
6. How does your leader stay attuned to the culture of the school and adapt to needs as they change?
7. What specific steps has your leader taken to manage conflict among staff members?

Concluding Comments: I would like to thank you for sharing your experiences with me.

Thank you.